



PRAXIPHANES
OF MYTILENE AND
CHAMAELEON
OF HERACLEA

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND DISCUSSION

**RUTGERS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN CLASSICAL HUMANITIES**

VOLUME XVIII

**EDITED BY
ANDREA MARTANO,
ELISABETTA MATELLI,
AND DAVID MIRHADY**

PRAXIPHANES
OF MYTILENE AND
CHAMAELEON
OF HERACLEA

**Rutgers University Studies
in Classical Humanities**

Series Editor: David C. Mirhady
Advisory Board: William W. Fortenbaugh
Dimitri Gutas
Pamela M. Huby
Timothy C. Powers
Eckart Schütrumpf

On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Work of Arius Didymus I

Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work II

*Theophrastean Studies: On Natural Science, Physics and
Metaphysics, Ethics, Religion and Rhetoric III*

Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos IV

*Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical, and Scientific
Writings V*

Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle VI

*The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical
Traditions presented to Professor I.G. Kidd VII*

Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources VIII

Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion IX

Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion X

Eudemus of Rhodes XI

Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes XII

Aristo of Ceos: Text, Translation and Discussion XIII

Heraclides of Pontus: Text and Translation XIV

Heraclides of Pontus: Discussion XV

Strato of Lampsacus: Text, Translation and Discussion XVI

Aristoxenus of Tarentum: Discussion XVII

PRAXIPHANES
OF MYTILENE AND
CHAMAELEON
OF HERACLEA

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND DISCUSSION

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN CLASSICAL HUMANITIES
VOLUME XVIII

EDITED BY
ANDREA MARTANO,
ELISABETTA MATELLI,
AND DAVID MIRHADY

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2012 by Transaction Publishers

Published 2017 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2012 by Taylor & Francis.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 2012020657

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea : text, translation, and discussion / Andrea Martano, Elisabetta Matelli, and David Mirhady, editors.

p. cm. -- (Rutgers University studies in classical humanities ; v. 18)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4128-4747-6

1. Praxiphanes--Criticism and interpretation. 2. Chamaeleon, of Heraclea Pontica--Criticism and interpretation. 3. Philosophy, Ancient. I. Martano, Andrea. II. Matelli, Elisabetta. III. Mirhady, David C., 1960- IV. Praxiphanes. V. Chamaeleon, of Heraclea Pontica.

PA4399.P57P73 2012

188--dc23

2012020657

ISBN 13: 978-1-4128-4747-6 (hbk)

In Memoriam

IRVING LOUIS HOROWITZ

who appreciated the work of Project Theophrastus
and has published Rutgers University Studies
in Classical Humanities since Volume I in 1983



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

Preface	ix-x
Contributors	xi
1. Praxiphanes of Mytilene called “of Rhodes”: The Sources, Text and Translation <i>Elisabetta Matelli</i>	1-156
2. Chamaeleon of Heraclea: The Sources, Text and Translation <i>Andrea Martano</i>	157-338
3. The Peripatos on Literature. Interpretation, Use and Abuse <i>Franco Montanari</i>	339-358
4. Chamaeleon on Pleasure and Drunkenness <i>William W. Fortenbaugh</i>	359-386
5. Something to Do with Dionysus: Chamaeleon on the Origins of Tragedy <i>David Mirhady</i>	387-410
6. Chamaeleon: Biography and Literature <i>Peri tou deina</i> <i>Stefan Schorn</i>	411-444
7. Aspects of the Epigraphical and Papyrological Tradition of Praxiphanes <i>Tiziano Dorandi</i>	445-462
8. “Praxiphanes of Rhodes held the same Opinions as Theophrastus” (Epiphanius, <i>De fide</i> 9.38) <i>Robert W. Sharples †</i>	463-476

9.	The διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν of Praxiphanes in the Testimony of Diogenes Laertius <i>Maddalena Vallozza</i>	477-494
10.	Thucydides <i>adoxos</i> and Praxiphanes <i>Michele Corradi</i>	495-524
11.	Praxiphanes, Who Is He? <i>Elisabetta Matelli</i>	525-578
	Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 3-11	579-594

Preface

This XVIIIth volume in the RUSCH series deals with Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes, two Peripatetic scholars of the 4th and 3rd centuries BC respectively, both of them connected with Theophrastus of Eresus, Aristotle's student, colleague and successor as head of the Peripatos, the 'School of Aristotle'.¹ The interests of members of the Peripatos ranged as widely as those of Aristotle and Theophrastus themselves, but the reconstructions of the evidence for Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes that are presented here reveal their particular interests in literary criticism in two ways: literary biography in the first case; textual criticism and linguistic research in the second. Both also seem to have been intellectuals active in the political and civic environments of the Hellenistic Period.

Like the other recent volumes in this series, this one presents new editions of the source texts for Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes, together with critical notes, translations and indices; as a whole, they represent a basis for reconstructing the cultural profiles of these thinkers both in the Hellenistic period and in later thought. The sources give both the title 'Grammarians', and this epithet reveals simultaneously both the main characteristic of their work and also the wide meaning of the word 'grammar', which even before the advent of the first technical *Grammatical Arts* in the 2nd century BC was connected with logic, poetics, rhetoric, and literary criticism, as well as chronological and biographical research. Most of the philosophical writings of Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes have been lost, but the present editors believe that they have to be considered philosophers – indeed Peripatetic philosophers – as well as grammarians and biographers: we can reconstruct their works and thought, however, only through fragments and testimonia that have been transmitted through the writings of ancient and medieval sources, which are themselves mainly concerned with ethics and grammar.

¹ Almost all of the volumes in the RUSCH series have been devoted to publication of the proceedings of the biennial conferences of Project Theophrastus. With volume IX the Project broadened its focus and began to take in other members of Aristotle's school: Demetrius of Phaleron (vol. IX), Dicaearchus of Messana (X), Eudemus of Rhodes (XI), Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes (XII), Aristo of Ceos (XIII), and Heracleides of Pontus (XIV & XV), Strato of Lampsacus (XVI), and Aristoxenus of Tarentum (XVII). Further volumes on Phainias of Eresus, Critolaus of Phaselis, and Clearchus of Soli are anticipated.

The editions of the texts related to Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes are followed in this volume by papers representing the proceedings of the international meeting *Cameleonte e Prassifane: frammenti per una storia della critica letteraria antica*, organized by W. W. Fortenbaugh, E. Matelli, D. Mirhady, and R. Sharples for Project Theophrastus and held on the 5th-7th of September, 2007 at the Swiss Institute (Istituto Svizzero) at Villa Maraini, Rome, thanks to the generous hospitality of its Director, Prof. Christoph Riedweg, and his team, as well as the British School at Rome. Papers that held different interpretations of the sources from the ones proposed by the Editors have been positively accepted, with the aim of keeping open the scientific dialectic that characterizes Project Theophrastus.

Sadly, Bob Sharples had already begun a long period of serious health problems before the 2007 meeting and, even if intellectually still very active, he could not take part in the discussions in Rome in September 2007, but let us read on that occasion and then publish his paper. On Thursday August 12th, 2010 he passed away. We miss him, with regret at his absence but also gratitude for the long enjoyment of his wisdom, energy, and generosity.

The present book does not contain the papers of Giulio Massimilla, of the University of Naples Federico II, “Prassifane e le finalità espressive del *deuteron proteron*,” and of Ettore Cingano, of the University Ca’ Foscari of Venezia, “Cameleonte interprete dei poeti lirici,” that enriched the discussions during the international meeting in Rome on the 5th-7th September 2007.

We are indebted to Barbara Anceschi for the redactional supervision, to Leonardo D’Angelone and Daniele Clarizia of the Editorial staff of EDUcatt in the Università Cattolica di Milano for the camera-ready composition of the texts.

A.M., E.M., D.M.

In March of this year, as the proofs of this volume were being read through for the last time, we learned the sad news that Irving Horowitz had passed away. At Bill Fortenbaugh’s suggestion, we have not hesitated to agree to dedicate the volume to his memory. A social scientist, Irving Horowitz was also a humanist, who unflaggingly leant his support and that of Transaction Publishers to Project Theophrastus and to classical studies at Rutgers.

Contributors

Michele CORRADI, Dipartimento di Filologia Classica, Sezione di Greco, Università degli Studi di Pisa, via Galvani 1, 56126 Pisa, ITALIA. bwvcorradi@libero.it

Tiziano DORANDI, Centre Jean Pépin, UPR 76, 7 rue G. Moquet, F 94801, Villejuif cedex, FRANCE. tiziano.dorandi@wanadoo.fr

William W. FORTENBAUGH, Department of Classics, Rutgers University, 131 George Street, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1414, USA. fortenb@rci.rutgers.edu

Andrea MARTANO, Istituto di Filologia Classica e di Papirologia, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Largo Gemelli 1, 20123 Milano, ITALIA. andrea.martano@unicatt.it

Elisabetta MATELLI, Istituto di Filologia Classica e di Papirologia, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Largo Gemelli 1, 20123 Milano, ITALIA. elisabetta.matelli@unicatt.it

David MIRHADY, Department of Humanities, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby BC V5A 1S6, CANADA. dmirhady@sfu.ca

Franco MONTANARI, Dipartimento di Antichità, Filosofia e Storia (D.A.FI.ST.), Università di Genova, via Balbi 4, 16126 Genova, ITALIA. montanari.franco@tiscali.it

Stefan SCHORN, Onderzoekseenheid Geschiedenis: Oudheid, KU Leuven, Blijde-Inkomststraat 21, postbus 3307, 3000 Leuven, BELGIUM. stefan.schorn@arts.kuleuven.be

†Robert W. SHARPLES, formerly University College London, Department of Greek and Latin, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, ENGLAND

Maddalena VALLOZZA, Dipartimento di Scienze dei Beni Culturali (Di.S.Be.C.), Università della Tuscia, Largo dell'Università, 01100 Viterbo, ITALIA. m.vallozza@tin.it



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

**Praxiphanes of Mytilene
(called ‘of Rhodes’):
The Sources, Text and Translation**

Elisabetta Matelli

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED	8
TEXTS	
I. LIFE	42
Name 1A-2B	42
Catalogues of Peripatetic Philosophers 3A-C	46
Pupil and Friend of Theophrastus 4A-*4D	48
Praxiphanes Shared Theophrastus’ Cosmological Theories in Continuity with Aristotle’s Teachings 5	50
The pupils	50
Epicurus? 6	50
Callimachus and Aratus? 7	52
Plato the Peripatetic 8	52
Considered the first ‘Grammarian’ 9A-C	54
Judgments on Praxiphanes	58
Praxiphanes among famous Rhodians 13	66

2	Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea	
	Proxenes and other Honors 14-17A-B	68
II.	WRITINGS	76
	List of Titles and Subjects 18.1-11	76
	Cosmology 19	78
	Ethics	80
	A Work on Friendship 20a-e	80
	On History 21	94
	Grammar	100
	Plato' and Isocrates' discussion about poets 22	100
	On numbering in Plato's <i>Timaeus</i> 17a 23A-B	102
	On complementary particles 24	104
	On Homer 25	108
	On literary Criticism 26	112
	From the first book <i>On Poems</i> 27	114
	On the Preface to Hesiod' <i>Works and Days</i> 28A-B	116
	Interpretation of Sophocles,	
	<i>Oedipus at Colonus</i> 900 29A-29C	120
	On a rare word 30A¹-30B	122
	Definition of a peculiar poetical genre 31	122
III.	Appendix on Grammar *32-33a-c	124
	INDEX OF SOURCES	140
	INDEX OF PARALLEL PASSAGES	143
	INDEX OF THE NAMES	150
	CONCORDANCE	153

INTRODUCTION

The present edition completes the work on the testimonia and fragments of Praxiphanes that was presented at the Project Theophrastus international conference *Filosofi della scuola di Aristotele. Cameleonte e Prassifane: frammenti per una storia della critica letteraria antica* [“Philosophers from Aristotle’s School. Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes: Fragments Toward a History of Ancient Literary Criticism”], held in Rome on Sept. 5-7, 2007 and hosted by the Swiss Institute and the British School of Rome.

Why bother with a new edition of Praxiphanes? The need for a new collection of the testimonia and fragments of this philosopher is suggested by the realization that progress in the study of the Hellenistic era and the editions provided by Project Theophrastus, especially from 1992 on, enable us to shed new light on Peripatetic thinkers who have remained obscure, although the evidence for them indicates that they were important figures in the history and culture of their times. Even what little evidence is left of them can now be inserted into, contextualized in and given their proper value within a more detailed historical reconstruction than was the case earlier. A case in point is Praxiphanes, a Peripatetic philosopher who lived in the 4th-3rd century BC, and who so far has only played a minor role in reconstructions of Hellenistic culture, history, and philosophy. Within the new framework, a new examination of the sources relating to him enables us to acquire more data with respect to previous research. This all reveals, I think, that he was in lively contact with the most important intellectual and cultural environments of the 3rd century BC and that he did not avoid political involvement.

The double ethnic name, Praxiphanes of Mytilene (called ‘of Rhodes’), which has been simplified in the cover-title, shows that Praxiphanes, born in Mytilene, was called ‘of Rhodes’, because he lived and flourished there with his activities for a long time. See the article “Praxiphanes, Who Is He?” in this volume.

To find sources concerning Praxiphanes I have, on the one hand, drawn on the information gathered by previous editors (Preller 1842, Brink 1946, Wehrli 1969²; also important Aly 1954); on the other hand, I have reviewed the sources independently, which has enabled me to link Praxiphanes with a few new textual passages, some of which, although they have already been studied by earlier scholars, for some

4 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

reasons have been omitted by the editors (in the notes I will try to account for my decisions).

In the following I will present the new testimonies not contained in Wehrli 1969². The asterisk (*) marks the fragments that I have attributed to Praxiphanes with probability.

Among the epigraphic sources:

1. *IG* 7.1752.6-7 (***15**) In a military list of ephebes from Thespieae in Boeotia there seems the name of a son of Praxiphanes, Dionousophaeis, named after his paternal grandfather. The presence of that name in a list of ephebes may indicate that Praxiphanes and his family received honorary citizenship in Thespieae, Boeotia, as well (cf. **28A-B**).

2. *IG* 12 *Suppl.* 127 (***16**) This decree documents the proxeny awarded by the city of Eresos to a probable descendant of Praxiphanes born at Mitylene (see Salvadori Baldascino 1990 pp. 65-66).

3. Two pieces of amphorae found at Alexandria in Egypt (***17 A-B**) and belonging to the collection of the antiquarian Johannes Demetrios (described by Neroutsos 1874 pp. 213-45) were already linked with Praxiphanes by Aly 1954 c. 1772.58-62, but are omitted by Wehrli 1969². Despite difficulties I find good reasons to consider these testimonies as probable, at least until the contrary can be proved. These two stamps show that (probably about 240 BC) a Praxiphanes was priest of the Sun and eponymous archon at Rhodes.

Among papyri sources:

4. *PDuke* inv. G 178 col. 2.17-22 (**3A**), already linked with Praxiphanes by Willis-Dorandi 1989, T1, pp. 81-82: our philosopher is found in a list of Peripatetic philosophers that corresponds to another one (**3B**).

5. *PHamb.* 128 (***33**), formerly attributed to Theophrastus, could instead bear witness to sections of the grammatical study on the elements of *lexis* with which Praxiphanes busied himself (cf. **9A-C, 23A-B, 24, 25, 27, 29A-C, 30A-B**).

6. *POxy.* 65.4457, fr. 2 (**26**), already connected with Praxiphanes by Lundon 1999, T3, pp. 646-7, contains a fragment whose interpretation is doubtful with respect to Praxiphanes' name (the abbreviation could be resolved either as *and Praxiphanes* or as *contra Praxiphanes*) in a context that can be safely identified as dealing with the history of grammatical studies.

Among literary sources:

7. Two grammatical texts regarding the formation of the name Πραξι-φάνης (**2A-B**). Although there is no precise reference to the identity of our philosopher, yet, as with Stesichorus, Lysimachus or Oedipus (in the same context), it seems plausible with respect to Praxiphanes, too, that the name refers to a well-known person. “Praxiphanes” is a rare name and Praxiphanes of Mitylene (and of Rhodes) seems to have been the only one to become at least moderately famous. In some grammatical literature he was known as “first grammarian” (**9A-C**).

8. Two entries in *Suda* referring to the word βλαύτη (**29B-C**) show that an accurate grammatical note by Praxiphanes (**29A**) was included in the lexicographical tradition after losing the name Praxiphanes.

9. A passage in Porphyry mentioned by Simplicius in the Proem to the Aristotelian *Categories* (***32**): a fragment present in the Theophrastus edition (= FHS&G 683), whose content seems closely connected to **24** and ***33**.

10. In **23A** and **23B** I have preferred to keep separate Porphyry’s testimony and that of Proclus, who cites him.

In the production of the text all sources have been tagged with a progressive number, **1** through **33**. Numbers followed by capital letters (e.g. **28A-28B**) may refer to parallel passages. In the case of papyri, a long text has been divided into parts each provided with a lowercase letter (e.g. **20a-e** and **33a-c**).

There are three apparatuses to the sources: 1. The first shows the concordances with former editions of Praxiphanes, other than Wehrli’s (this last one marked on the left side of the texts). 2. The second displays parallel passages that I consider useful for interpreting the passage at hand. It also contains references to the passages of critical editions of the authors mentioned by the source. 3. The third apparatus is critical with respect to readings, variants, and emendations of the source text. It is taken from whatever edition of the text I have used.

The reader will notice in the pages of the introduction the lack of a *conspectus* of the manuscripts cited in the apparatus to each source. This is intentional: after debating for a long time as to what method to use in editing fragmentary texts and considering different possibilities, I have reached the conclusion that the editor of fragments stemming from sources of the most disparate kinds (in the case of Praxiphanes we have direct and indirect quotations and testimonies from texts con-

6 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

served in medieval manuscripts, papyrus fragments – some of which are very old, from the end of the 3rd century BC – and from inscriptions contemporary to the philosopher himself) cannot be fully aware of all the philological issues of the corresponding apparatuses. Therefore, he or she must rely on the authority of the other editors, as it is impossible to undertake with competence a study of the manuscript tradition of every source *ex novo*. My apparatus is thus aimed only at indicating – albeit somewhat extensively – the textual problems and otherwise refers the reader to the edition itself.

This is not to say, of course, that in some cases it has not been necessary to change some readings or emendations or to modify the punctuation in an attempt to resolve passages unintelligible in the edition drawn upon or, in the case of the punctuation, to give the source a better meaning.

Only in the case of *POxy.* 8.1086 (25), because of the insoluble difficulties present in the available editions, have I provided a new edition of the text. I propose a new reading of *POxy.* 8.1086.11-18 (25), which was lastly presented by Lundon 1999, 2T, pp. 639-646, with an edition that fills the lacunae of the papyrus differently, following the suggestions of parallel passages from the scholiastic tradition. The new text highlights a valuable example of the exegetical work performed by Praxiphanes on the text of Homer, which seems to have inspired Aristarchus when he formulated his theory of “Homeric usage” with respect to *deuteron-proteron*.

The English translation is complete with footnotes aimed at helping interpretation of the passage. The first footnote always contains the bibliographical references. The article, contained in this volume, “Praxiphanes, Who Is He?” offers an opportunity for reflection and a synthesis of the whole. A specific and deeper commentary on every text is given in the Italian edition *Prassifane: testimonianze e frammenti. Filosofia e grammatica in età ellenistica* (Vita e Pensiero, Milano 2012).

This new edition of Praxiphanes is ultimately based on the pre-edition of the texts of Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes presented at the 2007 conference of Project Theophrastus in Rome. Following the goals of the Project Theophrastus conferences, the discussions after this presentation were intensive and useful. The papers, discussions, and subsequent reflections have also enabled this edition to improve upon the pre-edition. My special thanks go to Carlo Maria Mazzucchi, Tiziano Dorandi, and

David Mirhady for their suggestions, which have helped me fine-tune the work. A special thanks also to David Mirhady and Domingo Avilés for helping me in editing the English text, to Barbara Anceschi for her help with the production of the text, and to Leonardo D'Angelone of Officinaventuno and Daniele Clarizia of EDUCatt, Università Cattolica di Milano for carefully producing the camera ready text.

ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED

(a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections

<i>CAG</i>	<i>Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca</i> , edita consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae, I-XLVIII, Berlin 1882-1909
<i>CPF</i>	<i>Corpus dei Papiri filosofici greci e latini. Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina</i> . Firenze 1989-
<i>DK</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> , I-III, Griech.-Deutsch von H. Diels, hrsg. von W. Kranz, Berlin 1951-52 ⁶
<i>FDS</i>	K. Hülser, <i>Die Fragmente zur Dialektik der Stoiker. Neue Sammlung der Texte mit deutscher Übersetzung und Kommentaren</i> , 1-4, Stuttgart 1987-88
<i>FGrHist</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , hrsg. von F. Jacoby, Berlin-Leiden 1923-58
<i>FHG</i>	<i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , 1-5, ed. C.-Th. Müller, Parisiis 1875-83
<i>FHS&G</i>	<i>Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought & Influence</i> , edited by W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, R.W. Sharples, D. Gutas, A.D. Barker, J.J. Keaney, D.C. Mirhady, D. Sedley, M.G. Sollenberger, I-II, Leiden, New York, Köln 1992
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i> , Berlin 1987-1989
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> . Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae editae, Berlin 1873-1927
<i>IG²</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> . Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae editae, Berlin 1913 ss.
<i>Kl. Pauly</i>	<i>Der kleine Pauly. Lexicon der Antike</i> , I-V, hrsg. von K. Ziegler, W. Sontheimer, H. Gärtner, Stuttgart-München 1964-75
<i>LDAB</i>	The Leuven Database of Ancient Books, see http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.be/ldab_text.php
<i>LGGA</i>	<i>Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi</i> , see http://www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga/index.php
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , compiled by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, revised and augmented throughout by H.S. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars, Oxford 1968 (and following editions)
<i>MP³ (= Mertens-Pack³)</i>	<i>Catalogue des papyrus littéraires grecs et latins</i> , P. Mertens, ed., Liège http://www2.ulg.ac.be/facphl/services/cedopal/pages/mertensanglais.htm
<i>PCG</i>	<i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , ediderunt R. Kassel et C. Austin, Berlin and New York, 1-8, 1983-2001

PEG 1	<i>Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum</i> , Testimonia et Fragmenta, Pars 1, ed. A. Bernabé, Leipzig 1987
PMG	<i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> , ed. D.L. Page, Oxford 1962
POxy	<i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> , London 1898
PSI	<i>Papiri greci e latini</i> , Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto, a cura di G. Vitelli e altri, Firenze 1912-
RE	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertums-wissenschaft</i> , hrsg. von G. Wissowa, K. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, K. Ziegler, Stuttgart-München 1893-1980
RhGr 2-3	L. Spengel, <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> , II-III, Lipsiae 1854-1856
RUSCH 6	W.W. Fortenbaugh and D.C. Mirhady (eds.), <i>Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 6, New Brunswick and London 1994
RUSCH 8	J.M. van Ophuijsen, M. van Raalte (eds.), <i>Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 8, New Brunswick and London 1998
RUSCH 9	W.W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (eds.), <i>Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 9, New Brunswick and London 2000
RUSCH 10	W.W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (eds.), <i>Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 10, New Brunswick and London 2001
RUSCH 11	I. Bodnár and W.W. Fortenbaugh (eds.) 2002: <i>Eudemus of Rhodes</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 11, New Brunswick and London 2002
RUSCH 12	W.W. Fortenbaugh and S.A. White (eds.), <i>Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes, Text, Translation and Discussion</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 12, New Brunswick and London 2004
RUSCH 13	W.W. Fortenbaugh and S.A. White (eds.), <i>Aristo of Ceos, Text, Translation and Discussion</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 13, New Brunswick and London 2006
RUSCH 14	E. Schütrumpf (ed.), P. Stork, J.M. van Ophuijsen, S. Prince (translators), <i>Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translations</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 14, New Brunswick and London 2008
RUSCH 16	M.-L. Desclos, W.W. Fortenbaugh (eds.), <i>Strato of Lampsacus. Text, Translation, and Discussion</i> , Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 16, New Brunswick – London 2011
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , 1923-
SFOD 2004	see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Lyco
SFOD 2006	see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Aristo

10 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

SOD	see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Demetrius
SVF	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , edidit H. von Arnim, 1-4, Leipzig 1903
<i>Suppl.Hell.</i>	<i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> ediderunt H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, Berlin and New York 1983
<i>ThesCRA</i>	<i>Thesaurus Cultus et rituum antiquorum</i> , 5, <i>Personnel of Cult. Cult Instruments</i> , Los Angeles 2005
<i>TrGF</i>	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> : 1. <i>Didascaliae tragicae, Catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, testimonia et fragmenta, tragicorum minorum</i> , ed. B. Snell; editio correctior et addendis aucta curavit R. Kannicht. - 2. <i>Fragmenta adespota</i> , editores R. Kannicht et B. Snell. - 3. <i>Aeschylus</i> / editor S. Radt. - 4. <i>Sophocles</i> , editor S. Radt (F 730 a-g edidit R. Kannicht). 5/I-II. <i>Euripides</i> , ed. R. Kannicht, Göttingen 1981-2004 ²
Wehrli (Aristo)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> , Texte und Kommentar, <i>Lykon und Ariston von Keos</i> , 6, Basel-Stuttgart 1968 ² pp. 27-67
Wehrli (Chamael.)	see Wehrli (Prax.) pp. 44-63
Wehrli (Clearch.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> . Texte und Kommentar, <i>Klearchos</i> , 3, Basel-Stuttgart 1969 ²
Wehrli (Critol.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> . Texte und Kommentar, <i>Hieronymus von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler</i> , 10, Basel-Stuttgart 1969 ² pp. 43-73
Wehrli (Dem.Phil.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> , Texte und Kommentar, <i>Demetrios von Phaleron</i> , 4, Basel-Stuttgart 1968 ²
Wehrli (Dicaearch.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> , Texte und Kommentar, <i>Dikaiarchos</i> , 1, Basel-Stuttgart 1967 ²
Wehrli (Eud.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> . Texte und Kommentar, <i>Eudemos von Rhodos</i> , 8, Basel-Stuttgart 1969 ²
Wehrli (Heracl.P.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> . Texte und Kommentar, <i>Herakleides Pontikos</i> , 7, Basel-Stuttgart 1969 ²
Wehrli (Hieron.)	in Wehrli (Critol.) pp. 5-44
Wehrli (Lyco)	in Wehrli (Aristo) pp. 5-26
Wehrli (Prax.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> , Texte und Kommentar, <i>Phainias von Eresos, Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes</i> , 9, Basel-Stuttgart 1969 ^{2b} , pp. 89-115
Wehrli (Strat.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> . Texte und Kommentar, <i>Straton von Lampsakos</i> , 5, Basel 1969 ²
Wehrli (Hermipp.)	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> . Texte und Kommentar, <i>Hermippos der Kallimacheer</i> , Supplementband 1, Basel-Stuttgart 1974

(b) Ancient and Medieval Sources (texts and parallel passages)

AELIAN(US)	
<i>De natura animalium</i>	Claudii Aelianii <i>De Natura Animalium</i> , libri XVII, ex recognitione R. Hercheri, Lipsiae 1864

AMMONIUS <i>In Arist(otelis)</i> <i>De Interpretatione</i>	<i>Ammonius in Aristotelis de interpretatione commentarius</i> , ed. A. Busse, CAG 4.5 pp. 1-272
ANDROTION <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	<i>FGrHist</i> 324 3B pp. 60-77
ANONYM(US) <i>De Tropis</i>	Anonymus, <i>De Poeticis Tropis</i> in <i>RhGr</i> 3 nr. 29 pp. 207-214
A(NTHOLOGIA) P(ALATINA)	<i>Anthologia Graeca</i> , 1-4, ed. H. Beckby, München 1965-68 ²
APOLLODORUS ATHENIENSIS ap. Diog. Laert. Jacoby <i>FGrHist</i>	see Diogenes Laertius F. Jacoby, <i>Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente</i> , Berlin 1902 <i>FGrHist</i> 244, 2B pp. 1022-1128
APOLL(ONIUS) DYSOL(US) <i>De coniunctionibus</i>	<i>Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt</i> , rec. R. Schneider in <i>Grammatici Graeci</i> 2.1, Lipsiae 1878 pp. 213-58
APOLLONIUS MOLO <i>FGrHist</i> <i>LGGA</i>	<i>FGrHist</i> 728, 3C pp. 687-89 A. Ippolito, s.v. Apollonius [11] Molo, in <i>LGGA</i> (20/02/2005)
APOLL(ONIUS) SOPH(ISTA) <i>Lex(icon) Hom(ericum)</i>	<i>Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum</i> , rec. I. Bekker, Berlin 1833 = Hildesheim 1967
ARATI VITA	see <i>Vita Graeca Arati</i> 1
ARATUS SOLEUS Ἠρότολιος	<i>Suppl. Hell.</i> pp. 34-42 nrs. 83-120
ARISTARCHUS de grammatica <i>Fragmenta de Hesiodo</i>	see (c) Modern Works and Authors, Matthaios 1999 H. Waeschke, <i>De Aristarchi Studiis Hesiodiis</i> , in <i>Acta seminarii regii et societatis philologicae Lipsiensis</i> , Lipsiae 1874 pp. 151-72
ARISTO CEUS <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> Wehrli SFOD	Wehrli (Aristo) pp. 31-44 P. Stork-T. Dorandi-W.W. Fortenbaugh-J.M. van Ophuijsen (= SFOD), <i>Aristo of Ceos: The Sources Text and Translation</i> , in <i>RUSCH</i> 13, New Brunswick 2006 pp. 1-177
ARISTOPH(ANES) <i>Equites</i>	<i>Aristophanes</i> , ed. V. Coulon-M. Van Daele, 1, Paris 1923, pp. 80-141 (corrected repr. 1967)
ARISTOPH(ANES) BYZ(ANTII) <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	W.J. Slater, <i>Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta</i> , Berlin 1986

12 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

ARIST(OTELIS)	
<i>Categoriae</i>	<i>Aristotelis Categoriae et liber de interpretatione</i> , ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Oxonii 1949 pp. 3-45 (1a1-15b32)
<i>De anima</i>	<i>Aristotelis De anima</i> , rec. W.D. Ross, Oxonii 1956 (412b10-423b8)
<i>De interpr(etatione)</i>	<i>Aristotelis Categoriae et liber de interpretatione</i> , ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Oxonii 1949 pp. 49-72 (16a1-24b9)
<i>Metaph(ysica)</i>	<i>Aristotelis Metaphysica</i> , rec. W. Jaeger, Oxonii 1957 (980a10-1093b29)
<i>Poet(ica)</i>	<i>Aristotelis de Arte poetica liber</i> , rec. R. Kassel, Oxonii 1965 (1447a8-1462b19)
<i>Rhet(orica)</i>	<i>Aristotelis Ars rhetorica</i> , rec. W.D. Ross, Oxonii 1959 (1354a1-1420a8)
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Gigon	O. Gigon, <i>Aristotelis Opera</i> , 3, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1987
Rose 1863	V. Rose, <i>Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus</i> , Lipsiae 1863
Rose 1886	<i>Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum Fragmenta</i> , ed. V. Rose, Lipsiae 1886
Ross	<i>Aristotelis Fragmenta selecta</i> , ed. W.D. Ross, Oxford 1955
[ARIST(OTELIS)]	
<i>Rhet(orica)</i>	
<i>ad Alex(andrū)</i>	Pseudo-Aristote, <i>Rhétorique à Alexandre</i> , ed. P. Chiron, Paris 2002
<i>Problemata</i>	<i>Aristotelis quae feruntur Problemata physica</i> , ed. C. Ruelle, recogn. H. Knoellinger. Editionem post utriusque mortem curavit, praefatione ornavit Iosephus Klek, Lipsiae 1922
ASCLEPIADES	
Sens	<i>Asclepiades of Samos, Epigrams and Fragments</i> , edited with Translation and Commentary by A. Sens, Oxford 2011
BULLAE CERAMICAE	
ALEXANDRIAE	T.D. Neroutsos, “Κεραμίων λαβαὶ ἐνεπίγραφοι ἀνευρισκόμεναι ἐν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ,” Ἀθηναίων. Συγγραμματα περιοδικόν 3 (1874) pp. 213-45
CALLIM(ACHUS)	
<i>Aet(ia) I-II</i>	Callimaco, <i>Aitia, libri primo e secondo</i> , introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di G. Massimilla, Pisa 1996
<i>Aet(ia) III-IV</i>	Callimaco, <i>Aitia, libri terzo e quarto</i> , introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di G. Massimilla, Pisa 2010
<i>Epigr(ammata)</i>	
Pfeiffer 2	Callimachus, <i>Hymni et Epigrammata</i> , ed. R. Pfeiffer, 2, Oxonii 1953
<i>Hymn(i)</i>	See <i>Epigrammata</i>

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Pfeiffer 1

Callimachus, *Fragmenta*, ed. R. Pfeiffer, 1, Oxonii 1949

CARNEISCUS

Philistas

Il secondo libro del Filista (PHerc. 1027), edizione, traduzione e commento a cura di M. Capasso, Napoli 1988

Crönert 1906

see (c) Modern Works and Authors

Gaiser

K. Gaiser apud Capasso 1988 (“K. Gaiser, qui ad hanc editionem conficiendam mecum supplementa communicavit” p. 182)

Usener 1887

see Epicurus

Usener 1977

see Epicurus

CHOERILUS SAMIUS

PEG 1 pp. 188-89

CHRYSI(PPUS)

Testimonia et Fragmenta

SVF

Chrysippus Fragmenta logica et physica in SVF 2 pp. 1-348

FDS

see FDS in (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections

CIC(ERO)

Tuscul(anae)

M. Pohlenz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae disputationes*, Leipzig 1918

CLEM(ENS) ALEX(ANDRINUS)

Stromata

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata, Buch I-VI*, 2, hrsg. von O. Stählin, neu hrsg. von L. Früchtel, mit Nachträgen von U. Treu, GCS, Berlin 1985⁴

Meier

M.H.E. Meieri Opuscula Academica, edd. F.A. Eckstein et F. Haase, 2, Halis Saxonum 1863

CRATES MALL(OTES)

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Cratete di Mallo, I frammenti, edizione, introduzione e note a cura di M. Broggiato, Roma 2006

CRITOLAUS

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Wehrli (Critol.) pp. 49-58

DEMETR(IUS)

De elocutione

Démétrios, *Du Style*, texte établi et traduit par P. Chiron, Paris 1993

Finckh

Finckh ap. Chiron

Grube 1961

G.M. Grube, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style*, Toronto 1961

Muret

M.A. Muret, *Variae Lectiones* (Opera, vol. II), I, XVI, ed. Ruhnken, Leiden 1789

Radermacher

Demetrii Phalerei qui dicitur De Elocutione Libellus, ed. L. Radermacher, Stuttgart 1901 (editio stereotypa: 1967)

Roshdestwenski

S. Roshdestwenski, *Eis to Demetriou tou Phalereōs kaloumenon biblion peri hermeneias symbola*, Moscow 1896

14 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

DEMETRIUS PHAL(ERAEUS)

Testimonia et Fragmenta

P. Stork, J.M. van Ophuijsen, T. Dorandi (= SOD), *Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text, and Translation*, in RUSCH 9 pp. 1-310

DEXIPPUS

*In Aristotelis Categorias
Commentarium*

Dexippus, *In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, ed. A. Busse, CAG 4.2, Berlin 1888

DICAEARCHUS

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Wehrli

Wehrli (Dicaearch.) pp. 13-22

Mirhady

D.C. Mirhady, *Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text, and Translation*, in RUSCH 10 pp. 1-142

DIO CHRYSOST(OMUS)

Orat(iones)

Dionis Chrysostomi Orationes, ed. G. De Budé, Lipsiae 1919

DIOG(ENES) LAERT(IUS)

Vitae philosophorum

Diogenis Laertii Vitae philosophorum, ed. M. Marcovich, Stuttgartiae Lipsiae 1999

DIONYS(IUS)

HAL(ICARNASSENSIS)

De compositione verborum

Denys D'Alicarnasse, *Opusculum Rhétoriques*, 3, *La composition stylistique*, texte établi et traduit par G. Aujac et M. Lebel, Paris 1981

De Demosthene

Denys D'Alicarnasse, *Opusculum Rhétoriques*, 2, *Démosthène*, texte établi et traduit par G. Aujac et M. Lebel, Paris 1988

De Thucydide

Denys D'Alicarnasse, *Opusculum Rhétoriques*, 4, *Thucydide. Seconde Lettre à Ammée*, texte établi et traduit par G. Aujac et M. Lebel, Paris 1991, pp. 41-124 (commentary pp. 145-162)

DIONYS(IUS) THR(AX)

Ars Grammatica

Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica, ed. G. Uhlig, *Grammatici Graeci* 1.1, Lipsiae 1883 pp. 5-100

LGGA

L. Pagani in LGGA s.v. Dionysius [14] Thrax (28/06/2008)

EMPEDOCLES

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Empedocles 31 DK 1 pp. 276-374

EPICURUS

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Usener 1887

H. Usener, *Epicurea*, Leipzig 1887 (= Roma 1963)

Usener 1977

H. Usener, *Glossarium Epicureum* edendum curaverunt M. Gigante et W. Schmid, Roma 1977

Diano

C. Diano, *Epicuri Ethica*, Florentiae 1946

Arrighetti

Epicuro, *Opere*, a cura di G. Arrighetti, Torino 1973²

Laks

A. Laks, *Édition critique et commentée de la Vie d'Epicure dans Diogène Laerce (X. 1-34)*, in J. Bollack-A. Laks, *Études sur l'Épicurisme antique*, Lille 1976 pp. 1-118

EPIPH(ANIUS)

De fide

Holl-Dummer

Epiphanius, *Panarion haer.* 65-80. *De fide*, hrsg. von K. Holl, 2. bearb. Aufl. hrsg. von J. Dummer, 3, GCS, Berlin 1985² pp. 496.12-526.12

Diels

Epiphanii Advers. Haeres. III.2.9 in *Doxographi graeci*, collegit, recensuit, prolegomenis indicibusque instruxit H. Diels, Berolini 1879¹, introd. pp. 175-77, text pp. 589.23-593.20

ERATOSTHENES

Testimonia et Fragmenta

FGrHist.

FGrHist. 2B nr. 241 pp. 1010-21

EUDEMUS

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Wehrli (Eud.) pp. 9-72

EUPOLIS

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Eupolis, *Poetae Comici Graeci (PCG)* edd. R. Kassel et C. Austin, 5, Berolini et Novi Erboraci 1986 pp. 294-539: *Astrateutoi* fr. 35- 47 pp. 314-20

EURIP(IDES)

Meleager

Meleager in *TrGF* 5.1 nr. 46 pp. 554-568

Phoen(issae)

Euripides, *Phoenissae*, ed. D.J. Mastronarde, Leipzig 1988

EUST(ATHIUS)

Commentarii

ad Homeri Iliadem

Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, curavit M. Van der Valk, I, Lugduni Batavorum 1971

HER(ODOTUS)

Historiae

Herodoti Historiae, edidit H.B. Rosén, Stutgardiae Lipsiae 1997

HES(IODUS)

Opera et Dies

Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum, ed. F. Solmsen. *Fragmenta selecta* edd. R. Merkelbach et M.L. West, Oxonii 1970 pp. 49-85

Theogonia

ibidem pp. 111-149

HESYCH(IUS)

Lexicon

Latte 1953-1966

Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, recensuit et emendavit K. Latte, 1 (A-Δ), 2 (E-O), Hauniae 1953-1966

Hansen 2005

Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, recensuit et emendavit P.A. Hansen, 3 (Π-Σ), Berlin-New York 2005

Hansen-Cunningham
2009

Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, recensuerunt et emendaverunt P.A. Hansen et I. Cunningham, 4 (T-Ω), Berlin-New York 2009

Vita Aristotelis

T. Dorandi, "Vita Hesychii d'Aristote," *Studi Classici e Orientali* 52 (2006) pp. 87-106

Rose 1886

see Aristoteles

16 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Düring 1957	I. Düring, <i>Aristotle in the ancient biographical tradition</i> , Göteborg 1957
Gigon 1987	see Aristoteles
HIERONYMUS	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Wehrli	Wehrli (Hieron.) pp. 9-23
White	S. White, <i>Hieronymus of Rhodes</i> , The Sources, Text and Translation, in RUSCH 12 pp. 79-276
INSCRIPTIONES	
IG 7	<i>Inscriptiones Megaridis et Boeotiae</i> , ed. G. Dittenberg, Berolini 1892
Foucart 1885	P. Foucart, "Inscriptions de Béotie," <i>Bulletin de Corrispondance Hellénique</i> 9 (1885) pp. 403-43
IG 11.2	<i>Inscriptiones Deli. Tabulae archontum, Tabulae Hieropoeorum annorum 314-250</i> , ed. F. Dürrbach, Berolini 1912
IG 11.4	<i>Inscriptiones Deli, Decreta, Foedera, Catalogi, Dedications, Varia</i> , ed. P. Roussel, Berolini 1914
Dürrbach 1904	F. Dürrbach, "Fouilles de Délos (1902)," <i>Bulletin de Corrispondance Hellénique</i> 28 (1904) pp. 93-188
Wilhelm 1905	A. Wilhelm, "Praxiphanes," <i>Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archaeolog. Instituts</i> 8 (1905) pp. 1-5
Guarducci 1929	see (c) Modern Works and Authors, Guarducci 1929 nr. XIX p. 657
Haake 2007	see (c) Modern Works and Authors, Haake 2007 pp. 247-251
IG 12 Suppl.	R. Hodot, "Notes critiques sur le corpus épigraphique de Lesbos," <i>Études d'Archeologie Classique</i> , Nancy 5 (1976) pp. 17-81
Hodot	
Hiller von Gaertringen	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegei Praeter Delum, Supplementum</i> , ed. F. Hiller de Gaertringen, Berolini 1939
SEG 919	SEG 26 (1976-77) nr. 919 pp. 216-18
ISOCR(ATES)	
<i>Panath(enaicus)</i>	Isocrate, <i>Discours</i> , 4, <i>Panathénaique</i> , texte établi et traduit par É. Brémond, Paris 1962 pp. 86-159
JOANN(ES) PHILOP(ONUS)	
<i>De vocabulis quae diversum significatum exhibent secundum differentiam accentus</i>	Joannes Philoponus, <i>De vocabulis quae diversum significatum exhibent secundum differentiam accentus</i> , ed. L.W. Daly, Philadelphia 1983
<i>In Arist(otelis) Categorias Commentarium</i>	Joannes Philoponus, <i>In Aristotelis categorias commentarium</i> , ed. A. Busse, CAG 13.1, Berlin 1898
LEUCIPPUS	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	Leucippus: 67 DK 2 pp. 70-81
LEXICON E COD(ICE)	
COISLIN(IANO)	ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΛΕΞΕΩΝ ΧΡΗΣΙΜΩΝ, Texts of the Original Version and of MS. B, edited by I.C. Cunningham, Berlin-New York 2003
GRAEC(O) 345	

Bekker	I. Bekker, <i>Lexica Segueriana</i> 6, <i>Anecdota Graeca</i> , 1, Berolini 1814
Bachmann	L. Bachmann, <i>Anecdota Graeca</i> , 1-2, Leipzig 1828 (= Hildesheim 1965)
LYCO	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Wehrli	Wehrli (Lyco) pp. 9-15
SFOD 2004	P. Stork-T. Dorandi-W.W. Fortenbaugh-J.M. van Ophuijsen (= SFOD), <i>Lyco of Troas: The Sources Text and Translation</i> , in RUSCH 12, 2004 pp. 1-78.
MARCELL(INUS)	
<i>Vita Thucyd(idis)</i>	<i>Storie dello storico Tucidide</i> , edizione, traduzione e commento delle <i>Vite</i> , a cura di L. Piccirilli, Genova 1985
Casaubonus 1588 ap.	
Stephanum 1588	see Stephanus 1588
Casaubonus 1589	<i>Polyaeni Strategematum libri octo</i> , edidit, emendavit et notis illustravit. I. Casaubon, Lugduni 1589
Jones 1942	<i>Vita Thucydidis</i> ed. H.S. Jones, in <i>Thucydidis Historiae</i> , 1, Oxford 1942 ² pp. XI-XX
<i>FGrHist</i>	See (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections, <i>FGrHist</i> IIIC 696 33b
Meursius 1617	J. van Meurs, <i>Atticarum lectionum libri sex</i> , Lugduni 1617, II, Florentiae 1744
Bekker 1832	<i>Marcellini et Anonymi Vita Thucydidis</i> , in <i>Thucydidis De bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo</i> , iterum rec. I. Bekker, editio sterotypa, Berolini 1832
Poppo 1843	<i>Marcellini et scriptoris incerti Vita Thucydidis</i> , in <i>Thucydidis De bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo</i> , I, 1 explanavit E.F. Poppo, Gothae 1843
Ritter 1845	<i>Marcellini Vita Thucydidis</i> , in <i>Didymi Calcenteri Opuscula</i> , ed. F. Ritter, Coloniae 1845
Stahl 1886	<i>Marcellini et scriptoris incerti Vita Thucydidis</i> , in <i>Thucydidis De bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo</i> , I.1, expl. E.F. Poppo, auxit et emendavit I.M. Stahl, Lipsiae 1886 ³
Stephanus 1588	<i>In scholia Graeca Thucydidis adiuncta annotationes</i> , in <i>Thucydidis De bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo</i> , iidem Latine, ex interpretatione L. Vallae, ab H. Stephano recognita, secunda editio, Aureliae Allobrogorum 1588 et Francufurti 1594
MELANIPPIDES	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	Melanippides, <i>PMG</i> 757-766 pp. 392-395
MIMNERMUS	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
West	M.L. West, <i>Iambi et elegi graeci</i> , Oxonii 1992 ²
Allen	A. Allen, <i>The Fragments of Mimnermus</i> , Stuttgart 1993
NAUSIPHANES	Nausiphanes Teios 75 DK 2 pp. 246-50
NICERATUS HERACLEOTA	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	<i>Suppl. Hell.</i> nr. 564 p. 278

18 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

ORPHIC(I) HYMN(I)	<i>Inni orfici</i> , a cura di Gabriella Ricciardelli, Milano 2000
PANAETIUS RHODIUS Alesse 1997	Panezio di Rodi, <i>Testimonianze</i> , Edizione, traduzione e commento a cura di F. Alesse, Napoli 1997
PAPYRI <i>PDuke</i> inv. G 178 <i>PLitLond.</i> 182	see Praxiphanes, Willis-Dorandi ^a A. Wouters, <i>The grammatical papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity</i> , Brussels 1979 pp. 72-73
<i>PHamb.</i> 128	B. Snell, "Theophrast περὶ λέξεως I?," in <i>Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek mit einigen Stücken aus der Sammlung Hugo Ibscher</i> , hrsg. vom Seminar für Klassische Philologie der Universität Hamburg, Hamburg 1954 pp. 36-51
FHS&G	See (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections, FHS&G, Appendix 9 pp. 612-17
<i>PHerc.</i> 1027	see Carneiscus, <i>Philistas</i>
<i>PHerc.</i> 1425 et 1538	see Philodemus, <i>De poematibus</i>
<i>POxy.</i> 8.1086 Matelli 2009	E. Matelli, "Questioni di epica arcaica comuni a Prassifane e ad Aristarco," <i>Aevum</i> 83 (2009) pp. 31-60
Hunt 1911	A.S. Hunt, nr. 1086 <i>Scholia in Iliad II</i> in <i>POxy.</i> 8 (1911) pp. 77-99
Erbse 1969	See <i>Scholia in Iliadem</i>
Lundon 1999	See Praxiphanes, Lundon 1999
Lundon 2001	J. Lundon, "POxy. 1086 e Aristarco," in <i>Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia</i> , a cura di I. Andorlini, G. Bastianini, M. Manfredi, G. Menci, 2, Firenze 2001 pp. 827-839
Lundon 2002	J. Lundon, <i>Un commentario aristarcheo al secondo libro dell'Iliade: POxy. VIII 1086</i> , Firenze 2002
Nünlist 2008	See (c) Modern Works and Authors, Nünlist 2008
<i>POxy.</i> 65.4457 Haslam 1998	M.W. Haslam, <i>Notes on Scholaship</i> , in <i>P.Oxy.</i> 65, Oxford 1998 pp. 61-66
Cole Lundon 1999	quoted in Haslam's apparatus See Praxiphanes, Lundon 1999
<i>PSI</i> 1219 fr. 1	See <i>Scholia in Callimachi Aetia</i> 1
PHILITAS Sbardella	<i>Filita. Testimonianze e frammenti poetici</i> , introduzione, edizione e commento a cura di Livio Sbardella, Roma 2000
Spanoudakis	<i>Philitas of Cos</i> , ed. by K. Spanoudakis, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2002
PHILOD(EMUS) <i>De poematibus</i> Mangoni 1993	Filodemo, <i>Il quinto libro della Poetica (PHerc. 1425 e 1538)</i> , edizione, traduzione e commento a cura di C. Mangoni, Napoli 1993

Lucignano 1832-1844	N. Lucignano, <i>Illustrazioni del PHerc. 1425 e del PHerc. 1538</i> unpublished text read by Mangoni 1993, pp. 117-18
Dübner 1840	<i>Viris doctissimis humanissimis Philologis Gothae conventum agentibus s.p.d. F. Dübner. Insunt fragmenta Philodemi</i> περὶ ποιημάτων, Parisiis 1840
Crönert 1906	see (c) Modern Works and Authors
Kentenich 1895	G. Kentenich, <i>Librorum περὶ ποιημάτων volumina Herculanensia quantum fieri potest restituantur</i> . The lost manuscript is quoted in Jensen 1919, p. 5 n. 2 and Jensen 1923, p. VII n. 4 (see R. Janko - C. Mangoni†, <i>Philodemus On Poems, Book 3-4, Aristotle On Poets</i> , Oxford 2011 pp 153-154)
Jensen 1919	C. Jensen, “Neoptolemos und Horaz,” <i>Abhandl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. philos.-hist. Cl. Jahrgang 1918</i> , Berlin 14 (1919)
Jensen 1923	<i>Philodemus, Über die Gedichte fünftes Buch</i> . Griechischer Text mit Übersetzung und Erläuterung von C. Jensen, Berlin 1923
Capasso 1984	M. Capasso, “Prassifane, Epicuro e Filodemo. A proposito di Diog. Laert. X 13 e Philod. Poem. V IX, 10-X,1,” <i>Elenchos</i> 5 (1984) pp. 391-415
Mangoni 1991	C. Mangoni, “Nuove letture nei PHerc. 1425 e 1538 del V libro della Poetica di Filodemo,” <i>Cronache Ercolanesi</i> 21 (1991) pp. 65-82
PHILO <i>De congressu eruditionis gratia</i>	Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, 3, ed. P. Wendland, Berolini 1898 pp. 72-109
PHILOXENUS <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	<i>Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos</i> , hrsg. von Chr. Theodoridis, Berlin-New York 1976
PHOT(IUS) <i>Lexicon</i>	<i>Photii Patriarchae Lexicon</i> , ed. C. Theodoridis, 1 (A-Δ), Berlin-New York 1982
<i>Biblioth(eca)</i>	Photius, <i>Bibliothèque</i> , 3, (= codices 186-222), texte établi et traduit par R. Henry, Paris 1962
PIND(ARUS) <i>Pyth(ica)</i>	Pindaro, <i>Le Pitiche</i> , a cura di B. Gentili, P.A. Bernardini, E. Cingano, P. Giannini, Milano 1995
<i>Isthmia</i>	Pindaro, <i>Le Istmiche</i> , a cura di G. A. Privitera, Milano 1982
PISANDER <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	Pisander in <i>PEG</i> 1 pp. 164-171
PLATO COMICUS <i>PCG</i>	Plato in <i>PCG</i> 7 pp. 431-548
PLATO PHILOSOPHUS <i>Crat(ylus)</i>	<i>Platonis opera. Cratylus</i> , edd. E.A. Duke, W.F. Hicken, W.S.M. Nicoll, D.B. Robinson, J.C.G. Strachan, I Oxonii 1995 pp. 187-275 (Stephanus 1 pp. 383a-440e)

20 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

<i>Phaedr(us)</i>	<i>Platonis Opera</i> , ed. J. Burnet, 2, Oxford 1901 (Stephanus 3 pp. 227a-279b)
<i>Symp(osium)</i>	<i>Platonis Opera</i> , ed. J. Burnet, 2, Oxford 1901 (Stephanus 3 pp. 172a-223d)
PLUT(ARCHUS)	
<i>Quaest(iones) Conv(ivales)</i>	<i>Plutarchi Moralia</i> , 4, ed. C. Hubert, Lipsiae 1938
<i>Pericles</i>	<i>Plutarchi Vitae parallelae</i> , 1.2, ed. K. Ziegler, Lipsiae 1964 ³ , pp. 1-47
[Plut(archus)]	<i>Plutarchi Moralia</i> , 5.2.1, ed. J. Mau, Leipzig 1971, pp. 50-153
<i>Placita Philosophorum</i>	
POLEMON	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Preller	<i>Polemonis periegetae Fragmenta</i> , collegit, digress., not. auxit L. Preller, Lipsiae 1838
FHG	FHG 3 pp. 108-148
POLL(UX)	
<i>Onomasticon</i>	<i>Pollucis Onomasticon</i> , ed. E. Bethe, 1-2, Leipzig 1900-1931
PORPHYRIUS	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Smith	<i>Porphyrii Philosophi Fragmenta</i> , ed. A. Smith, Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae 1993
<i>In Aristotelis Categorias</i>	See Simplicius, <i>In Aristotelis Categorias</i>
<i>In Platonis Timaeum</i>	<i>Porphyrii in Platonis Timaeum Commentariorum Fragmenta</i> , collegit et disposuit A.R. Sodano, Neapoli 1964
POSIDIPPUS	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Austin - Bastianini	<i>Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia</i> , C. Austin - G. Bastianini edd., Milano 2002
POSIDONIUS	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	Poseidonios, <i>Die Fragmente</i> , hrsg. von W. Theiler, 1 (Texte), 2 (Erläuterung), Berlin-New York 1982
PRAXIPH(ANES)	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Bagordo	A. Bagordo, <i>Die antiken Traktate über das Drama</i> . Mit einer Sammlung der Fragmente, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998, nr. 77 Praxiphanes Mytilenensis vel Rhodius *F1, p. 161
Brink	K.O. Brink, "Callimachus and Aristotle: an Inquiry into Callimachus' Πρὸς Πραξιφάνη," <i>Classical Quarterly</i> 40 (1946) pp. 11-26
LGGA	M. Corradi, s.v. Praxiphanes, <i>LGGA</i> , (15/01/2007 and 23/09/2009)
Lundon 1999	J. Lundon, 86 Praxiphanes 2T, 3T, in <i>CPF</i> I.1***, pp. 639-46, 646-47
Manetti-Montanari	D. Manetti - F. Montanari, 86 Praxiphanes T4, in <i>CPF</i> I.1***, pp. 647-51

Preller	L. Preller, <i>De Praxiphane peripatetico inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobili disputatio</i> , Dorpati, 1842 (a dissertation, republished in <i>Ausgewählte Aufsätze aus dem Gebiete der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft</i> , hrsg. von R. Kohler, Berlin 1864)
Wehrli	See Wehrli (Prax.) pp. 93-100
Willis-Dorandi ^a = Willis-Dorandi ^b	W.H. Willis - T. Dorandi, 1 Lista di scolarchi in CPF, I.1*, pp. 81-84 = 86 Praxiphanes T1 1 in CPF I.1***, p. 639
Willis	W.H. Willis, "Two literary Papyri in an Archive from Panopolis," <i>Illinois Classical Studies</i> 3 (1978) pp. 140-53
PROCL(US) <i>Commentaria in Hesiodi Opera et Dies</i>	
Pertusi	<i>Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies</i> , rec. A. Pertusi, Milano 1955
Diehl	<i>Procli Diadochi In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria</i> , ed. E. Diehl, 1, Lipsiae 1903
FHS&G Gaisford	see FHS&G in (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections <i>Poetae minores Graeci</i> , instruxit Th. Gaisford, editio nova, F.V. Reizii annotationibus in Hesiodum, plurium poetarum fragmentis, aliisque accessionibus aucta, 2, Lipsiae 1823
Rzach	A. Rzach, <i>Hesiodi Carmina</i> , Lipsiae 1903
Marzillo	<i>Der Kommentar des Proklos zu Hesiods Werken und Tagen</i> , hrsg. von P. Marzillo, Tübingen 2010
<i>In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria</i>	<i>Procli Diadochi In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria</i> , ed. E. Diehl, 1, Lipsiae 1903
PS.-HERODIANUS <i>De Figuris</i>	Ps.-Herodianus, <i>De Figuris. Überlieferungsgeschichte und kritische Ausgabe</i> , hrsg. von K. Hajdú, Berlin-New York 1998
<i>RhGr</i> 3	See <i>RhGr</i> 3 pp. 83-104
QUINT(ILIANUS) <i>Inst(itutio) Or(atoria)</i>	<i>M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae libri duodecim</i> , recogn. brevisque adnotatione critica instruxit M. Winterbottom, Oxonii 1970
SATYRUS <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Schorn	<i>Satyrus aus Kallatis</i> , Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar von S. Schorn, Basel 2002
<i>SCH(OLIA IN) ARISTOPH(ANIS)</i> <i>ACH(ARNENSES)</i>	<i>Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes</i> , ed. W.J.W. Koster, Groningen 1978 pp. 3-328
<i>SCH(OLIA IN) ARISTOPH(ANIS)</i> <i>VESP(AS)</i>	<i>Prolegomena de Comoedia. Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves</i> , ed. N.G. Wilson, Groningen 1975 pp. 1-150

22 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- SCHOL(IA) IN CALLIM. AETIA* Callimaco, *Aitia, libri primo e secondo*, introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di G. Massimilla, Pisa 1996
- Norsa-Vitelli 1933 M. Norsa - G. Vitelli, "Da papiri della Società Italiana," *Bulletin de la Société d'Archeologie d'Alexandrie* 28 (1933) pp. 123-32
- Coppola 1932-33 G. Coppola, "Il prologo degli Aitia e il commento di Epaphroditus," *Rendiconto delle sessioni della Accademia delle scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna. Classe di scienze morali* 3.7 (1932-1933) pp. 30-55
- Norsa-Vitelli 1935 M. Norsa - G. Vitelli, "1219. Frammenti di Scholia agli Αἴτια di Callimaco," in *PSI* 11 (1935) pp. 139-49
- Pfeiffer 1 See Callimachus, *Fragmenta*
- Van Rossum-Steenbeek 1998 M. Van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' digest? Studies on a selection of subliterate papyri*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1998
- Bastianini 2006 *Callimaco. Cent'anni di papiri callimachei*, in *Callimaco. Cent'anni di papiri*, a cura di G. Bastianini, Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi, Firenze 9-10 giugno 2005, Studi e Testi di Papirologia N.S. 8, Firenze 2006 pp. 149-166
- SCHOL(IA) IN CALLIM. IA(MBOS)*
- Pfeiffer 1 See Callimachus, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*
- SCHOL(IA) IN DIONYSIUM THRACEM*
- PROLEG(OMENA) VOSS(IANA)* *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, rec. A. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci*, recogniti et apparatu critico instructi, 3.1, Lipsiae 1901, pp. 1-10
- SCHOL(IA) IN DIONYSIUM THRACEM LONDINENSIA* *Ibidem* pp. 442-565
- SCHOL(IA) IN DIONYS(IUM) THR(ACEM) VAT(ICANA)* *Ibidem* pp. 106-292
- SCHOL(IA IN) IL(IADEM)* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, ed. H. Erbse, Berolini 1969 (vol. 1), 1975 (vol. 4), 1977 (vol. 7)
- SCHOL(IA IN) OD(YSSEAM)* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam (scholia vetera)*, 1-2, ed. W. Dindorf, Oxford 1855
- SCHOL(IA IN) PIND(ARI) NEM(EA)* *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, rec. A.B. Drachmann, Lipsiae 1927
- SCHOL(IA) IN PLAT(ONIS) SYMP(OSIUM)* G.C. Greene, *Scholia Platonica*, Haverfordiae in civitate Pennsylvaniae 1938
- Cufalo *Scholia Graeca in Platonem*, ed. D. Cufalo, I, *Scholia ad Dialogos Tetralogiarum I-VII continens*, Roma 2007
- SCHOL(IA) IN SOPH(OCLIS) OED(IPUM) COL(ONEUM)* V. De Marco, *Scholia in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum*, Romae 1952

<i>SCHOLIA IN THEOCRITUM</i>	K. Wendel, <i>Scholia in Theocritum</i> , Lipsiae 1914
SELEUCUS ALEXANDRINUS	
<i>FHG</i>	Seleucus Alexandrinus, <i>FHG</i> 3 p. 500
<i>LGGA</i>	G. Ucciardello, s.v. Seleucus [3] Homericus, in <i>LGGA</i> (5/09/2006)
SEXT(US) EMP(IRICUS)	
<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>	H. Mutschmann - J. Mau, <i>Sexti Empirici Opera</i> , 3, Lipsiae 1954 pp. 1-177
SIMPL(ICIUS)	
<i>In Arist(otelis) Categorias</i>	<i>Simplicii in Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium</i> , ed. C. Kalbfleisch, <i>CAG</i> 8, Berlin 1907
SOPH(OCLES)	
<i>Oed(ipus) Col(oneus)</i>	Sophocles, <i>Oedipus Coloneus</i> , tertium ed. R.D. Dawe, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1996
<i>Aiax</i>	Sophocles, <i>Aiax</i> , tertium ed. R.D. Dawe, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1996
<i>TrGF</i>	See (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections <i>TrGF</i> vol. IV
STOB(AEUS) <i>Anth(ologium)</i>	<i>Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium</i> , recc. C. Wachsmuth et O. Hense, 1-5, Berlin 1884-1912 (= 1958)
STRABO	
<i>Geographica</i>	
Radt	<i>Strabons Geographika</i> , Band 4, Buch XIV-XVII, mit Übersetzung und Kommentar, hrsg. von S. Radt, Göttingen 2005
Cobet	C.G.Cobet, <i>Miscellanea critica quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos praesertim Homerum et Demosthenem</i> , Leiden 1876 (= Hildesheim-New York 1981): the chapter <i>Ad Strabonem cap. III</i> is at pp. 206-223
Meineke	<i>Strabonis Geografica</i> , rec. A. Meineke, 3, Lipsiae 1853 (repr. anast. 1925)
STRATO	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Sharples	See RUSCH 16 pp. 5-229
Wehrli	See Wehrli (Strato) pp. 9-42
<i>SUDA</i>	A. Adler, <i>Suidae Lexicon</i> , 1-4, Lipsiae, 1928 = 1989, 1931 = 1994, 1933 = 1994, 1935 = 1989
THEAGENES	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	Theagenes 8 DK 1 pp. 51-52
THEODECTES	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Baierus-Sauppe	<i>Oratores Attici</i> , recensuerunt, adnotaverunt scholia fragmenta, indicem nominum addiderunt Io. G. Baierus-H. Sauppius, Zürich 1850 = Hildesheim 1967 pp. 246-248

24 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

THEOGNOSTUS

*Canones sive
De orthographia*

*Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecarum
Oxoniensum*, 2, ed. J.A. Cramer, Oxford 1835 = Amsterdam
1963

THEOPHR(ASTUS)

Hist(oria) Plant(arum)

Théophraste, *Recherches sur les plantes*, I (Livres 1-2), II
(Livres 3-4), III (Livres 5-6), IV (Livres 7-8), V (Livre 9),
texte établi et traduit par S. Amigues, Paris 1988, 1989, 1993,
2003, 2006

Testimonia et Fragmenta

FHS&G

see (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections

THEOPOMPUS

*Testimonia et Fragmenta
FGrHist*

FGrHist 115 2B pp. 526-617, 3B p. 742 (Addenda)

TIMOTH(EUS)

Pers(ae)

The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus, ed. with an intro-
duction and commentary by J. H. Hordern, Oxford 2002, fr.
788-91 pp. 84-95

TRYPH(ON) ALEXANDRINUS

*De tropis
RhGr 3*

see (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections

RhGr 3 pp. 191-206

TRYPH(ON)

*Testimonia et Fragmenta
West*

M.L. West, "Tryphon, *De tropis*," *Classical Quarterly* 15
(1965) pp. 236-248

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Von Velsen

A. Von Velsen, *Thryphonis Grammatici Alexandrini Frag-
menta*, Berlin 1853 = Amsterdam 1965

TZETZES

*In Hesiodi Opera
Commentarium*

Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies, rec. A. Pertusi,
Milano 1955

VITA DIONYS(II)

PERIEG(ETAE)

R. Kassel, *Antimachos in der Vita Chistiana des Dionysios
Periegetes*, in *Catalepton. Festschrift für Bernard Wyss*,
Basel 1985

VITA GRAECA ARATI 1

(olim sub auctore
Achille Tatio)

Maass

Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae, ed. E. Maass, Berolini
1898 pp. 76-79

Martin

Scholia in Aratum, ed. J. Martin, Stutgardiae 1974 pp. 6-10

Di Maria

*Achillis quae feruntur Astronomica et in Aratum Opuscula. De
Universo. De Arati Vita. De Phaenomenorum Interpretatione*,
ed. G. Di Maria, Palermo 1996 pp. 59-62

VITA GRAECA ARATI 3

VITA LATINA ARATI

Maass

Martin, pp. 14a-17a (see Martin quoted in *Vita graeca Arati* 1)

see Pfeiffer quoted in Callimachus, *Testimonia et Fragmenta*
Maass, pp. 146-151 (see Maass quoted in *Vita graeca Arati* 1)

Martin	<i>Vita</i> 3 pp. 14 col. a-17 col. a Martin (see Martin quoted in <i>Vita graeca Arati</i> 1)
VITA THUCYD(IDIS) ANONIMA	see Marcellinus, Jones 1942 pp. XXI-XXIII
ZENO SIDONIUS <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	“I Frammenti di Zenone Sidonio,” ed. A. Angeli - M. Colaizzo, <i>Cronache Ercolanesi</i> 9 (1979) pp. 47-133
[ZONARAS] <i>Lexicon</i>	Zonaras, <i>Lexicon</i> , ed. J.A.H. Tittmann, I-II, Leipzig 1808 = Amsterdam 1967

(c) Modern Works and Authors

Alesse 1997	see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Panaetius Rhodius
Algra 1999	<i>The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy</i> , K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld, M Schofield edd., Cambridge 1999
Alpers 2001	K. Alpers, <i>s.v.</i> Lexikographie, in <i>Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik</i> , hrsg. von G. Ueding, 5, Darmstadt 2001, coll. 194-210
Aly 1954	W. Aly, <i>s.v.</i> Praxiphanes 1, <i>RE</i> , 22.2 (1954) coll. 1769.30-84.32; <i>s.v.</i> Praxiphanes 2, <i>RE</i> , 22.2 (1954) coll. 1784.32-40
Angeli 1988	A. Angeli, <i>Filodemo, Agli Amici di scuola</i> , Napoli 1988
Arrighetti 1968	G. Arrighetti, “Il POxy XIII 1611: Alcuni problemi di erudizione antica,” <i>Studi Classici e orientali</i> 17 (1968) pp. 76-98
Arrighetti 1973	see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Epicurus
Ascheri 2009	P. Ascheri, <i>s.v.</i> Demetrius [4], in <i>LGGA</i> (12/02/2009 and 08/06/2009)
Asper 1997	M. Asper, “Onomata Allotria. Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion Poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos,” <i>Hermes Einzelschriften</i> 75 (1997)
Ax 1982	W. Ax, “Aristarch und die Grammatik,” <i>Glotta</i> 60 (1982) pp. 96-109
Ax 1986	W. Ax, <i>Stimme und Sprache, Studien zu drei Grundbegriffen der antiken Sprachtheorie</i> , Hypomnemata 84, Göttingen 1986
Bachmann 1828	see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, <i>Lexicon e Codice Coisliniano Graeco</i> 345
Baratin 1989	M. Baratin, <i>La Naissance de la Syntaxe à Rome</i> , Paris 1989
Baratin-Desbordes 1981	M. Baratin, F. Desbordes, <i>L’analyse linguistique dans l’antiquité classique</i> , Paris 1981
Baslez 2005	“Le dévots de l’Apollon de Délos: au-delà du panhellénisme officiel,” in <i>Prosopographie et histoire religieuse. Actes de Colloque tenu en l’Université Paris XII-Val-de Marne</i> , les 27 et 28 octobre 2000, ed. par M.-F. Baslez, Paris 2005 pp. 35-49
Bastianini 2006	see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, <i>Scholia in Callimachi Aetia</i>
Bechtel 1917	F. Bechtel, <i>Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit</i> , Halle 1917

26 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Beloch 1925 K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, IV.I², Berlin-Leipzig 1925
- Bennekom 1975 T. van Bennekom, "The definition of σύνδεσμος and ἄρθρον in Aristotle poetics, Ch. 20", *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975) pp. 399-411
- Bethe 1900 E. Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon*, Lipsiae 1900
- Bignone 1920 (1964) E. Bignone, *Epicuro, Opere frammenti, testimonianze della sua vita*, Bari 1920 = Roma 1964
- Bignone 1936 (1973²) E. Bignone, *L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione filosofica di Epicuro*, 1-2, Firenze 1936 = 1973², edizione accresciuta (su Prassifane in particolare I pp. 420-22, 555-56 n. 308)
- Blank 1996 D.L. Blank, *Ammonius, On Aristotle's On Interpretation 1-8*, London 1996
- Blank 1998 D.L. Blank, *Sextus Empiricus. Against the Grammarians (Adversus Mathematicos I)*, Oxford 1998
- Bleckmann 1907 F. Bleckmann, *De inscriptionibus quae leguntur in vasculis Rhodiis*, Diss. Göttingen, Gottingae 1907
- Bleckmann 1912 F. Bleckmann, "Zu den Rhodischen Eponymen Heliospriestern," *Klio* 12 (1912) pp. 249-58
- Bodnár - Fortenbaugh 2002 See (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections, RUSCH 11
- Bonitz 1870 *Aristotelis Opera*, V, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta. Scholiorum in Aristotelem supplementum. Index Aristotelicus*, Berolini 1870
- Brink 1940 K.O. Brink, s.v. Peripatos, *RE*, Suppl. 7 (1940) coll. 899.36-949.45
- Brink 1941 K.O. Brink, s.v. Phormion nr. 8, *RE*, 20.1 (1941) coll. 541.35-57
- Brink 1946 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Praxiphanes
- Broggiato 2006 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Crates Mallotes
- Brussich 2000 Laso di Ermione, *Testimonianze e frammenti*, a cura di G.F. Brussich, Pisa 2000
- Buck 1928 C.D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*, Chicago-London 1928
- Burkert 1998 W. Burkert, *La religione greca*, trad. italiana a cura di G. Arrigoni, Milano 1998 (original title *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln 1977)
- Busse 1887 *Porphirii Isagoge et In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium, consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae edidit A. Busse*, Berolini 1887 (CAG 4.1)
- Bux 1939 E. Bux, s.v. Marcellinus, nr. 49, *RE*, 14.2 (1939) coll. 1450.52-487.34
- Calboli 1962 G. Calboli, *Studi grammaticali*, Bologna 1962
- Calboli 1969 *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*, Introduzione, testo critico e commento a cura di G. Calboli, Bologna 1969
- Calboli 1998 G. Calboli, "From Aristotelian λέξις to elocutio," *Rhetorica* 16 (1998) pp. 46-80

- Calboli 2007 G. Calboli, "The Metaphor after Aristotle," in *Influences in Peripatetic Rhetoric. Essays in Honor of William W. Fortenbaugh*, Leiden 2007 pp. 123-50
- Cameron 1995 A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton 1995
- Canfora 1999 L. Canfora, *Il mistero di Tucidide*, Milano 1999 (translated from *Le mystère Thucydide. Enquête à partir d'Aristote*, Paris 1997)
- Capasso 1984 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Philodemus
- Capasso 1988 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Carneiscus, *Philistas*
- Cataudella 1929 Q. Cataudella, "Due luoghi di Filodemo, Περὶ ποιημάτων V," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 57 (1929) pp. 244-46
- Chase 2003 M. Chase, *Simplicius, On Aristotle's "Categories 1-4,"* Ithaca, 2003
- Chiron 1993 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Demetrius, *De elocutione*
- Chiron 2001 P. Chiron, Un rhéteur méconnu: Démétrios (Ps.-Démétrios de Phalère), Essai sur les mutations de la theorie du style à l'époque hellénistique, Paris 2001
- Christ-Schmid 1920 W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, II.1, bearb. von W. Schmid, München 1920⁶ = 1959 (On Praxiphanes at p. 80)
- Cingano 2009 "The Hesiodic Corpus," in *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, ed. by F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, Chr. Tsagalis, Leiden Boston 2009
- Classen 1829 J. Classen, *De Grammaticae Graecae Primordiis*, Bonnae 1829
- Cohn 1905 L. Cohn, s.v. *Dionysodoros* (n. 18), *RE* 5.1 (1905) coll. 1005.4-37
- Conovici-Irimia 1991 N. Conovici, M. Irimia, "Timbres amphoriques et autres inscriptions céramiques découverts à Satu Nou (comm. d'Oltima, dép. de Costanza)," *Dacia* 35 (1991) pp. 139-174
- Coppola 1932 G. Coppola, "Poeti e Telchini," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* N.S. 10 (1932) pp. 327-38
- Coppola 1932-33 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, *Scholia in Callimachi Aetia*
- Crönert 1906 W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, Leipzig 1906 (Amsterdam 1965): on Praxiphanes pp. 69-72 and 179 (Nachträge)
- Dahlmann 1953 H. Dahlmann, *Varro's Schrift De Poematis*, Mainz 1953
- Dahlmann 1963 H. Dahlmann, "Studien zu Varro 'De poetis,'" *Akademie der Wissenschaft und Literatur* 10, Mainz 1963
- Davies 1971 J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971
- De Witt 1954 N.W. De Witt, *Epicurus and His Philosophy*, Minneapolis 1954 (on Praxiphanes pp. 56-60)
- Del Mastro 2001 G. Del Mastro, "La paragraphos nei PHerc. 1425 e 1538," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 31 (2001) pp. 107-31

28 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Della Corte 1971 F. Della Corte, *Rodi e l'istituzione dei pubblici studi*, in *Opuscula I*, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica, Genova 1971 pp. 12-15
- Di Gregorio 2008 L. Di Gregorio, "Sui frammenti di Simia di Rodi," *Aevum* 82 (2008) pp. 51-117
- Di Marco 1989 M. Di Marco, *Timone di Fliunte. Silli*, Roma 1989
- Diano 1946 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Epicurus
- Diels 1879 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Epiphanius
- Dihle 1998 A. Dihle, "Eratosthenes und andere Philologen," in *Festschrift für H. Görgemanns*, Heidelberg 1998 pp. 86-93
- Dillon 1990 *Dexippus. On Aristotle Categories*, translated by J. Dillon, London 1990
- Dindorf 1885 *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, ed. G. Dindorfius, I-II, Oxonii 1885
- Dittenberg 1892 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Inscriptiones: IG 7
- Dorandi 1991 T. Dorandi, *Ricerche sulla cronologia dei filosofi ellenistici*, Stuttgart 1991
- Dorandi 1999 T. Dorandi, *Chronology*, in Algra 1999 pp. 31-54
- Dorandi 2006 T. Dorandi, "Vita Hesychii d'Aristote," *Studi Classici e Orientali* 52 (2006) pp. 87-106
- Dürnbach 1904 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Inscriptiones: IG 11.4
- Edelstein - Kidd 1972-89 L. Edelstein - I.G. Kidd, *Posidonius I, The Fragments*, Cambridge 1972-89; *Posidonius II, The Commentary*, Cambridge 1988
- Edwards 1930 W.M. Edwards, "The Callimachus Prologue and Apollonius Rhodius," *The Classical Quarterly* 24 (1930) pp. 109-12
- Eggs 2001 E. Eggs, s.v. Metapher, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, hrsg. von G. Ueding, 5, Darmstadt 2001, coll. 1099-1183
- Empereur - Hesnard 1987 J.-Y. Empereur-A. Hesnard, "Les amphores hellénistiques" in *Céramiques hellénistiques et romaines*, 2, 1987
- Engels 2005 J. Engels, "ἄνδρες ἐνδοξοί or 'men of high reputation' in Strabo's *Geography*," in *Strabo's Cultural Geography. The Making of a Kolossourgia*, edd. D. Deck, H. Lindsay, S. Potheary, Cambridge 2005, pp. 129-43
- Erbse 1969 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, *Scholia in Iliadem*
- Erbse 1975 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, *Scholia in Iliadem*
- Erbse 1977 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, *Scholia in Iliadem*
- Erler - Schorn 2007 "Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit," in *Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 26.-29. Juli 2006 in Würzburg*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin- New York).
- Fantuzzi - Hunter 2002 M. Fantuzzi, R. Hunter, *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto*, Bari 2002
- Ferrero 1963 L. Ferrero, *Tra poetica et historica: Duride di Samo*, in *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni*, Torino 1963 pp. 68-100

- Festugière 1966 A.J. Festugière, *Proclus, Commentaire sur le Timée*, Traductions et notes, I, Paris 1966
- Finkielsztejn 2001 G. Finkielsztejn, *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ*, BAR International Series 990, Oxford 2001
- Flashar 1983 *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Band 3, *Ältere Akademie. Aristoteles-Peripatos*, hrsg. von H. Flashar, Basel-Stuttgart 1983
- Flashar 2004 *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Band 3, *Ältere Akademie. Aristoteles-Peripatos*, 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage, hrsg. von H. Flashar, Basel 2004
- Fornara 1983 C.W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983
- Fortenbaugh - Mirhady 1994 see (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections, RUSCH 6
- Fortenbaugh - White 2004 see (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections, RUSCH 12
- Fortenbaugh 2005 W.W. Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus of Eresus, Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought, and Influence. Commentary*, VIII, *Sources on Rhetoric and Poetics*, Leiden-Boston 2005
- Foucart 1885 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Inscriptions: IG 7
- Fränkel 1915 H. Fränkel *De Simmia Rhodio*, Göttingen 1915
- Fraser 1972 P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I Text, II Notes, III Indexes, Oxford 1972
- Fraser 1996 P.M. Fraser, s.v. Eratosthenes, in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford 1996³ pp. 553-54
- Fraser - Matthews 1987-2005 P.M. Fraser - E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, voll. I-IV, Oxford 1987-2005: I 1987 (*The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*), II 1994 (*Attica*), III.A 1997 (*The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily, and Magna Graecia*), III.B 2000 (*Central Greece: From the Megarid to Thessaly*), IV 2005 (*Thrace, northern regions of the Black Sea*)
- Frede 1978 M. Frede, "Principles of Stoic Grammar," in *The Stoics*, ed. J. Rist, Berkeley 1978 pp. 27-75 = M. Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, Minneapolis, 1987 pp. 301-37, 371-72
- Friedlaender 1853 L. Friedlaender, *Aristonici ΠΕΡΙ ΣΗΜΕΙΩΝ ΙΑΙΑΔΟΣ*, Gottingae 1853
- Gabrielsen et al. 1999 *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, edd. V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle, Aarhus 1999
- Gallavotti 1932 C. Gallavotti, "Il prologo e l'epilogo degli 'Aitia'," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* N.S. 10 (1932) pp. 231-46
- Garulli 2005 V. Garulli, "Posidippo in Schol. Flor. Call. Aet. Fr. 1Pf. (PSI XI 1219)," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 154 (2005) pp. 23-24
- Gauthier 1985 P. Gauthier, "Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e-I^e siècle avant J.C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, Suppl. 12 (1985).

30 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Geus 2002 K. Geus, *Eratosthenes von Kyrene. Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, München 2002
- Gigante 1998 M. Gigante, “Zenone Sidonio e la poesia,” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 28 (1998) pp. 85-98
- Gigante 1999 M. Gigante, *Kepos e Peripatos. Contributo alla storia dell’aristotelismo antico*, Napoli, 1999
- Gigon 1987 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Aristoteles, *Fragmenta*
- Glucker 1978 J. Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, Göttingen 1978
- Gomperz 1890 T. Gomperz, “Philodem und die aesthetischen Schriften der herculanischen Bibliothek,” *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 123 (1890) pp. 1-88
- Görler 1994 W. Görler, “Die Stoa in der Mitte und zweiten Hälfte des erstens Jahrhunderts vor Christus,” in *Die Philosophie der Antike*, IV, *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, hrsg. von H. Flashar, Basel 1994
- Gottschalk 1998 H. Gottschalk, s.v. Eudemos, in *Der Neue Pauly*, 4, Stuttgart, Weimar 1998 coll. 216-19
- Gottschalk 2001 H. Gottschalk, s.v. Praxiphanes, *Der Neue Pauly*, 10, Stuttgart, Weimar 2001 coll. 279-80
- Gottschalk 2002 H. Gottschalk, “Eudemus and the Peripatos,” in Bodnár-Fortenbaugh 2002 pp. 25-37
- Gow - Page 1965 A.S.F. Gow – D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, I-II, Cambridge 1965
- Grace 1934 V. Grace, “Stamped amphora handles found in 1931-1932,” *Hesperia* 3 (1934) pp. 321-26
- Grace 1955 V. Grace, “Ancient Greek Wine Jar Fragments in Collections in Alexandria,” *Year Book of the American Philosophical Society* (1955) pp. 321-26
- Grace 1959 V. Grace, “Ancient Greek Wine Jar or Commercial Amphoras,” *Year Book of the American Philosophical Society* (1959) pp. 472-77
- Greenberg 1955 N.A. Greenberg, *The Poetic Theory of Philodemus*, (Diss. Harvard 1955), London-New York 1990
- Grube 1952 G.M.A. Grube, “Theophrastus as a Literary Critic,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 83 (1952) pp. 172-83
- Guarducci 1929 M. Guarducci, “Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri di età ellenistica. Ricerche di epigrafia greca nel campo della letteratura e del costume,” in *Memorie della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali Storiche e Filologiche* 6.2 fasc. 9 (1929) pp. 629-665
- Guidorizzi-Beta 2000 G. Guidorizzi e S. Beta, *La metafora*, Pisa 2000
- Guidorizzi - Avezzi - Cerri 2008 Sofocle, *Edipo a Colono*, Introduzione e commenti di G. Guidorizzi, testo critico a cura di G. Avezzi, traduzione di G. Cerri, Milano 2008

- Haake 2007 M. Haake, *Der Philosoph in der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistischen Poleis*, München 2007
- Harles 1793 Ioannis Alberti Fabricii *Bibliotheca Graeca*, editio quarta curante G.C. Harles, 3, Hamburgi 1793
- Hadot 1987 *Simplicius, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa survie*, Actes du colloque International de Paris (25 sept. 1er Oct. 1985) organisé par le Centre de Recherche sur les oeuvres et la pensée de Simplicius, édité par I. Hadot, Berlin-New York 1987
- Haslam 1998 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Papyri: *POxy.* 65.4457
- Herter 1931 H. Herter, s.v. Kallimachos aus Kyrene, nr. 6, *RE*, Suppl-Bd. 5 (1931) coll. 386.29-452.64
- Herter 1937 H. Herter, "Literatur zur hellenistischen Dichtung aus den Jahren 1921-1935," *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 255 (1937) pp. 82-218
- Heylbut 1876 G. Heylbut, *De Theophrasti libris περὶ φιλίας*, Diss. Philol. Bonnae 1876
- Hicks 1938 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of eminent philosophers*, with an English translation by R.D. Hicks, 1-2, Cambridge Mass. – London 1938 = 1980
- Higbie 2003 C. Higbie, *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of Their Past*, Oxford 2003
- Hiller von Gaertringen 1931 F. Hiller von Gaertringen, s.v. Rhodos, *RE*, Suppl. 5 (1931) coll. 731.30-840.67
- Hiller von Gaertringen 1939 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Inscriptiones: *IG* 12 Suppl.
- Hirzel 1877 R. Hirzel, *Untersuchungen zu Cicero's Philosophischen Schriften*, I, *De natura deorum*, Leipzig 1877
- Hirzel 1878 R. Hirzel, "Die Thukydideslegende," *Hermes* 13 (1878) pp. 46-49
- Hirzel 1895 R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, I, Leipzig 1895 (= Hildesheim 1963)
- Hodot 1976 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Inscriptiones: *IG* 12 Suppl.
- Hoffmann 1987 P. Hoffmann, "Catégories et langage selon Simplicius. La question du 'skopos' du traité aristotélicien des 'Categories'," in Hadot 1987 pp. 61-90
- Homolle 1886 *Les Archives de l'Intendance sacrée a Délos (315-166 av. J.-C.)*. Thèse présentée a la Faculté des Lettres de Paris par Th. Homolle, Paris 1886
- Huby 1999 P.M. Huby, *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary*, IV, *Sources on Psychology*, Leiden 1999
- Hunt 1911 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Papyri, *POxy* 8.1086
- Hunter 2002 R. Hunter, *L'eziologia degli 'Aitia' di Callimaco*, in Fantuzzi – Hunter 2002 pp. 61-120

32 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Huxley 1969 G. Huxley, "Choirilos of Samos," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 10 (1969) pp. 12-29
- Innes 1985 D.C. Innes, "Theophrastus and the Theory of Style," in *Theophrastus of Eresus. On His Life and Work*, edd. W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, A.A. Long, New Brunswick and Oxford 1985 pp. 251-267
- Ippolito 2005 A. Ippolito s.v. Apollonius [11] Molo, in *LGGA* (20/02/2005)
- Isnardi Parente 1983² M. Isnardi Parente, *Opere di Epicuro*, Torino 1983²
- Janko 1984 R. Janko, *Aristotle on Comedy: Towards a Reconstruction of Poetics II*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1984
- Janko 1991 R. Janko, "Philodemus' *On Poems* and Aristotle's *On Poets*," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 21 (1991) pp. 5-64
- Janko 2000 R. Janko, *Philodemus, On Poems, Book 1*, Oxford 2000
- Jebb 1885 Sophocles, *The Plays and Fragments*, Part 2, *The Oedipus Colonoëus*, ed. R. C. Jebb, Cambridge 1885
- Jensen 1919 C. Jensen, "Neoptolemos und Horaz," in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrgang 1918, Nr. 14, Berlin 1919
- Jensen 1923 *Philodemus. Über die Gedichte: fünftes Buch*. Griechischer Text mit Übersetzung und Erläuterung von C. Jensen, Berlin 1923
- Jensen 1936 C. Jensen, "Herakleides vom Pontos bei Philodem und Horaz," *Sitzungsb. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. philos.-hist. Kl.* (1936) pp. 292-320
- Jessen 1913 O. Jessen, s.v. Helios, *RE*, 8 (1913) coll. 58.1-93.22
- Kamerbeek 1984 *The Plays of Sophocles*, Commentaries, Part 7, *The Oedipus Coloneus*, ed. J.C. Kamerbeek, Leiden 1984
- Kassel 1965 *Aristotelis de Arte poetica liber*, rec. R. Kassel, Oxonii 1965
- Kassel 1976 *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*, ed. R. Kassel, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1976
- Kassel 1985a R. Kassel, "Der Peripatetiker Prytanis," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 60 (1985) pp. 23-24
- Kassel 1985b R. Kassel, "Antimachos in der *Vita Chisiana* des Dionysios Periegetes," in *Catalepton. Festschrift für Bernard Wyss*, Basel 1985 pp. 69-76
- Kidd 1988 I. G. Kidd, *Posidonius, The Commentary, Fragments 150-293*, II.ii, Cambridge 1988
- Kinkel 1877 *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. G. Kinkel, Lipsiae 1877
- Kraus 2001 M. Kraus, s.v. Logos, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, hrsg. von G. Ueding, 5, Darmstadt 2001
- Krevans 2004 N. Krevans, "Callimachus and the Pedestrian Muse," in *Callimachus II*, ed. M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Waccher, Leuven, Paris, Dudley (MA) 2004 pp. 173-83
- Konstan 1997 D. Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge 1997

- Labarre 1996 G. Labarre, *Les Cités de Lesbos aux époque hellénistique et impériale*, Paris 1996
- Laks 1976 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Epicurus
- Lallot 1998 *La grammaire de Denys le Thrace*, traduit et annotée par J. Lallot, Paris 1998
- Laqueur 1934 R. Laqueur, s.v. Theagenes nr. 9, *RE*, Zweite Reihe 5 (1934) col. 1347.34-69
- Laurenti 1973 Aristotele, *Dell'anima*, in *Le opere*, traduzione di R. Laurenti, 4, Bari 1973 pp. 97-191
- Lefkowitz 1981 M. R. Lefkowitz, *Lives of Greek Poets*, Baltimore 1981
- Lehnus 1993 L. Lehnus, "I due Dionisii (Psi 1219 Fr. 1, 3-4)," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 97 (1993) pp. 25-28
- Lehnus 2000 L. Lehnus, *Nuova bibliografia callimachea* (1489-1998), Alessandria 2000
- Lelli 2005 E. Lelli, "Posidippo e Callimaco," in *Posidippo e gli altri. Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario*, Atti dell'Incontro di studio, Roma 14-15 maggio 2004, a cura di M. Di Marco, B.M. Palumbo, E. Lelli, *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 6, Pisa-Roma 2005 pp. 77-132
- Leo 1894 F. Leo, *Hesioda*, Gottingae 1894
- Lienhard 1950 M.K. Lienhard, *Zur Entstehung und Geschichte von Aristoteles' Poetik*, Diss. Zürich 1950
- Lübker 1914² F. Lübker, s.v. Phraxiphanes, in *Reallexikon des klassischen Altertums*, Leipzig-Berlin 1914² pp. 854-55
- Lucas 1968 Aristotle, *Poetics*, ed. D.W. Lucas, Oxford 1968
- Lund 1999 J. Lund, "Rhodian Amphorae in Rhodes and Alexandria as Evidence of Trade," in Gabrielsen 1999 pp. 187-204
- Lundon 2002 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Papyri: POxy 8.1086
- Luschnat 1954-55 O. Luschnat, "Die Thucydides-scholien," *Philologus* 99 (1954-55) pp. 14-58
- Maass 1883 E. Maass, *Analecta Eratosthenica*, Berlin 1883
- Maass 1892 E. Maass, *Aratea*, Berlin 1892
- Maass 1898 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, *Vita Graeca Arati I*
- Maas 1937 P. Maas "Die litterarische Form der Diegeseis und der 'scholia Florentina'. Exkurs I," in *Papiri della Regia Università di Milano*, 1, Milano 1937 pp. 155-61
- Mair 1955 *Callimachus, Hymns and Epigrams, Lycophron*, with an English translation by A.W. Mair, *Aratus*, with an English translation by G.R. Mair, Cambridge Massachusetts, London 1955
- Mangoni 1991 C. Mangoni, "Nuove letture nei PHerc. 1425 e 1538 del V libro della *Poetica* di Filodemo," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 21 (1991) pp. 65-82
- Mangoni 1993 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Philodemus
- Marek 1984 Chr. Marek, *Die Proxenie*, Frankfurt 1984

34 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Martano 2004 Martano, A. 2004. “Hieronymus ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου,” in Fortenbaugh - White 2004 pp. 457-74
- Martin 1974 J. Martin, *Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode*, München 1974
- Matelli 1992 E. Matelli, “Ἐνδιάθετος εὐπροφορικὸς λόγος, note sull’origine della formula e della nozione,” *Aevum* 66 (1992) pp. 43-70
- Matelli 2004a E. Matelli, “Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes,” in Fortenbaugh - White 2004 pp. 289-314
- Matelli 2004b E. Matelli, “Grammata didaskein a Rodi nel III-II sec. a.C.,” in R. Pretagostini - E. Dettori (curr.), *La cultura ellenistica. L’opera letteraria e l’esegesi antica. Atti del Convegno COFIN 2001, Università di Roma Tor Vergata’, 22-24 settembre 2003*, Roma 2004 pp. 307-325
- Matelli 2009 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Papyri, *POxy* 8.1086
- Matelli 2010 E. Matelli, *Peripato e Orfismo a Rodi*, in A. Bernabé, F. Casadesús, M.A. Santamaría (eds.), *Orfeo y el orfismo; nuevas perspectivas*, Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes 2010 pp. 421-54 <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/orfeo-y-el-orfismo-nuevas-perspectivas--0/>, published also in *Aevum Antiquum* n.s. 6 (2006) pp. 391-422
- Matelli 2012 E. Matelli, *Prassifane: testimonianze e frammenti. Filosofia e grammatica in età ellenistica*, Milano 2012
- Mathieu - Brémond 1962 *Isocrate*, 4, texte établi et traduit par G. Mathieu et É. Brémond, Paris 1962
- Matthaios 1999 S. Matthaios, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*, Göttingen 1999
- Matthews 1996 V.J. Matthews, *Antimachus of Colophon, Text and Commentary*, Leiden 1996
- Mau 1971 *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. V, Fasc. 2, pars 1, ed. J. Mau, Leipzig 1971
- Mayer 1910 *Theophrasti περὶ λέξεως libri fragmenta*, collegit A. Mayer, Lipsiae 1910
- Mazon 1993 P. Mazon, *Hésiode. Théogonie, Les Travaux et les Jours, Le Bouclier*, Paris 1993
- Mazzarino 1966 S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico*, I, Bari 1966
- Mazzucchi 1997 C.M. Mazzucchi, “Fozio (Biblioteca, codd. 213, 350). Longino e la critica ellenistica,” *Aevum Antiquum* 10 (1997) pp. 247-66
- Merkelbach 1956 R. Merkelbach, “Literarische Texte unter Ausschluss der Christlichen,” *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 16 (1956) pp. 82-126
- Meyer 1954 *Pausanias, Beschreibung Griechenlands*, ed. E. Meyer, Zürich 1954
- Michaelis 1875 J. Michaelis, *De Apollonii Rhodii fragmentis*, Diss. Halis Saxonum 1875
- Momigliano 1974 A. Momigliano, *Lo sviluppo della biografia greca*, Torino 1974

- Montanari 1994 F. Montanari, "Introduzione," in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, ed. F. Montanari, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 40, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994 pp. 1-5, 29-30 (Discussion)
- Montanari 1999 F. Montanari, "Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature," *RUSCH* 9 1999 pp. 391-411
- Montanari 1989 E. Montanari in *CPF* [I.1*], 24 Aristoteles p. 395
- Montanari E. 1999 E. Montanari in *CPF* [I.1***], 103 Theophrastus p. 869
- MorauX 1973 P. MorauX, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen. Von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisia*, Berlin 1973
- Morelli 1959 D. Morelli, "I culti in Rodi," *Studi Classici ed Orientali* 8 (1959)
- Murray-Dimock 1995 Homer, *The Odyssey*, with an English translation by A.T. Murray, revised by G.E. Dimock, Cambridge Mass., London 1995
- Mützell 1833 *De emendatione Theogoniae Hesiodae libri tres*, scripsit G.J. C. Mützell, Lipsiae 1833
- Mygind 1999 B. Mygind, "Intellectuals in Rhodes," in Gabrielsen 1999 pp. 247-93
- Neumann 1998 U. Neumann, s.v. Katachrese, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, hrsg. von G. Ueding, 4, Darmstadt 1998, coll. 911-15
- Nünlist 2008 R. Nünlist, *The ancient critic at work: terms and concepts of literary criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge 2009
- Nicolai 1992 R. Nicolai, *La storiografia nell'educazione antica*, Pisa 1992
- Orth 1932 E. Orth, "Katalepton I," *Philologische Wochenschrift* 52 (1932) coll. 1314-17
- Pagani 2006 L. Pagani, s.v. Dionysodorus, in *LGGA* (20/02/2006)
- Pagani 2009 L. Pagani, s.v. Asclepiades (3), in *LGGA* (20/02/2006, 15/01/2009)
- Papageorgius 1888 *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera*, Lipsiae 1888
- Pape 1875 W. Pape, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, Dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von G.E. Benseler, I-II, Braunschweig 1875
- Pesce 1981 Aristotele, *La Poetica*, Introduzione, traduzione, parafrasi e note di Domenico Pesca, Milano 1981
- Pfeiffer 1968 R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship, from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968
- Piccirilli 1985 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Marcellinus
- Podlecki 1969 A.J. Podlecki, "The Peripatetics as Literary Critics," *Phoenix* 23 (1969) pp. 114-137
- Pohlenz 1918 M. Pohlenz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae disputationes*, Leipzig 1918
- Pohlenz 1933 M. Pohlenz, "Kallimachos' Aitia," *Hermes* 68 (1933) pp. 313-27
- Pohlenz 1939 M. Pohlenz, "Die Begründung der abendländischen Sprachlehre durch die Stoa," *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der*

36 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., Fachgruppe 1, Altertumswissenschaft, N.F. 3.6, Göttingen 1939 pp. 151-198 = *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von H. Dörrie, Hildesheim 1965 pp. 39-86
- Pontani 1999 F. Pontani, "The first word of Callimachus' *Aitia*," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 128 (1999) pp. 57-59
- Powell 1925 *Collectanea alexandrina. Reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 a.C., epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum*, edidit I.U. Powell, Oxonii 1925
- Preller 1842 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Praxiphanes
- Primo 2010 A. Primo, "Mito e storia nella Χρονική σύνταξις di Zenone di Rodi: osservazioni su Strabone XIV 2.5-12," *Ancient Society* 40 (2010) pp. 239-63
- Rabe 1890 H. Rabe, *De Theophrasti libris περὶ λέξεως*, Diss. Bonnae 1890
- Radt 2009 *Strabons Geographika*, Band 8, Buch XIV-XVII: Kommentar, hrsg. von S. Radt, Göttingen 2009
- Regenbogen 1940 O. Regenbogen, s.v. Theophrastus 3, *RE*, Suppl. 7 (1940) coll. 1354.17-1562.31
- Reinach 1885 S. Reinach, "Les arétalogues dans l'antiquité," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 9 (1885) pp. 257-65
- Ritter 1845 *Didymi Chalcenteri Opuscula auctori suo restituta ad codices antiquos recognita annotatione illustrata*, ed. F. Ritter, Coloniae 1845
- Rhys Roberts 1902 *Demetrius on Style*, edited after the Paris Manuscript by W. Rys Roberts, Cambridge 1902
- Richardson 1994 N.J. Richardson, "Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship," in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, ed. F. Montanari, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 40, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994 pp. 7-28, 29-38 (Discussion)
- Ritschl 1866 F. Ritschl, *Commentationis de Agathonis vita, arte et tragoediarum reliquiis particula*, Diss. Halis Saxonum 1829 = *Opuscula philologica*, I, Lipsiae 1866
- Robert 1966 L. Robert, *Monnaies antiques en Troade*, Genève, Paris 1966
- Rodis-Lewis 1975 G. Rodis-Lewis, *Épicure et son école*, Paris 1975
- Rohde 1914 E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, Leipzig 1914³ (Darmstadt 1960⁴)
- Rose 1863 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Aristoteles, *Fragmenta*
- Rose 1886 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Aristoteles, *Fragmenta*
- Rossetti-Furiani 1993 L. Rossetti - P.L. Furiani, "Rodi," in *Lo spazio Letterario della Grecia antica*, direttori G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza, I, *La produzione e la circolazione del testo*, II, *L'Ellenismo*, Roma 1993 pp. 657-715 (pp. 673-675 about Praxiphanes)

- Rostagni 1926 A. Rostagni, "Il dialogo aristotelico ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΩΝ. I-II," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* N.S. 4 (1926) pp. 433-70 = *Scritti Minori*, I, Torino 1955 pp. 255-293
- Rostagni 1927 A. Rostagni, "Il dialogo aristotelico ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΩΝ. III," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* N.S. 5 (1927) pp. 145-173 = *Scritti Minori*, I, Torino 1955 pp. 293-322
- Rostagni 1928 A. Rostagni, "Il prologo degli ἈΙΤΙΑ. Testo e interpretazione," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 56 (1928) pp. 1-52 = *Scritti Minori*, II.1, Torino 1956 pp. 259-307
- Rostagni 1933 A. Rostagni, "I nuovi frammenti di commento agli *Aitia* e la polemica letteraria di Callimaco," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 61 (1933) pp. 189-210 = *Scritti Minori*, II.1, Torino 1956 pp. 311-31
- Sacerdoti 1975 N. Sacerdoti, *Epicuro*, Milano 1975
- Salvatori Baldascino 1990 L. Salvatori Baldascino, "Mnasilaos oppure Mnasilas," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 20 (1990) pp. 65-66
- Sbardella 2000 L. Sbardella, *Filita: testimonianze e frammenti*, Roma 2000
- Schenkeveld 1990 D.M. Schenkeveld, "The Stoic Τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς," *Mnemosyne* 43 (1990) pp. 86-108
- Schenkeveld 1993a D.M. Schenkeveld, "The lacuna at Aristotle's *Poetics* 1457b33," *American Journal of Philology* 114 (1993) pp. 85-89
- Schenkeveld 1993b D.M. Schenkeveld, "A Hellenistic *Ars Poetica*," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 97 (1993) pp. 67-80
- Schenkeveld 1994a D.M. Schenkeveld, Scholarship and Grammar, in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, ed. F. Montanari, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 40, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994 pp. 263-301, 302-06 (Discussion)
- Schenkeveld 1994b D.M. Schenkeveld, "Ta *asteia* in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*," in Fortenbaugh - Mirhady 1994 pp. 1-14
- Schenkeveld 1998 D.M. Schenkeveld, "Theophrastus' Rhetorical Works: One Rhetorical Fragment the Less, One Logical Fragment the More," in van Ophuijsen - van Raalte 1998 pp. 67-80
- Schenkeveld - Barnes 1999 D.M. Schenkeveld - J. Barnes, "Language," in Algra 1999 pp. 177-225
- Schmid 1894 W. Schmid, "Zur antiken Stillehre aus Anlass von Proklos' Chrestomathie," *Rheinisches Museum* 49 (1894) pp. 133-61
- Schmidt 1839, M. Schmidt, *Commentatio de Theophrasto rhetore*, Diss. Halle 1839
- Schmidt 1912 K.Fr.W. Schmidt, Review of "The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part VIII, edited with translation and notes by A.S. Hunt, London 1911," in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 11 (1912) pp. 633-652
- Schmidt 1950a J. Schmidt, s.v. Platon 7 (Schuler des Panaitios), *RE*, 20.2 (1950) col. 2542.36-42

38 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Schmidt 1950b J. Schmidt, s.v. Platon 8 (Schüler des Aristoteles), *RE*, 20.2 (1950) col. 2542.43-44
- Schmidt 1950d J. Schmidt, s.v. Platon 9 (Schüler des Praxiphanes), *RE*, 20.2 (1950) col. 2542.45-46
- Schneider 1902 *Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt*. Commentarium criticum et exegeticum in Apollonii Scripta Minora, R. Schneider ed. in *Grammatici Graeci*, 2.2, Lipsiae 1902
- Schoemann 1862 G.F. Schoemann, *Die Lehre von den Redetheilen nach den Alten*, Berlin 1862
- Schöll 1878 R. Schöll, "Zur Thukydides-Biographie," *Hermes* 13 (1878) pp. 447-451
- Scholz 1998 P. Scholz, *Der Philosoph und die Politik. Die Ausbildung der philosophischen Lebensform und die Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Philosophie und Politik im 4. und 3. Jh. v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1998
- Scholz 2004 P. Scholz, "Peripatetic Philosophers as Wandering Scholars: Some remarks on the Socio-Political Conditions of Philosophizing in the third Century BCE," in *RUSCH* 12 2004 pp. 315-53
- Schütrumpf 2006 see (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections, *RUSCH* 14
- Sens 2011 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Asclepiades
- Sharples 1998 *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary*, vol. 3.1, *Sources on Physics (Texts 137-223)*, ed. by R.W. Sharples with contribution on the Arabic material by D.D. Gutas, Leiden 1998
- Sharples 2006 R.W. Sharples, "Natural Philosophy in the Peripatos after Strato," in *RUSCH* 13 2006 pp. 307-27
- Simon-Suisse 1839 J. Simon-Suisse, *Du commentaire de Proclus sur le Timée de Platon*, Paris 1839
- Slater 1986 W.J. Slater, *Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta*, Berlin 1986
- Snell 1954 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Papyri: *PHamb.* 128
- Sodano 1964a A.R. Sodano, *In Platonis Timaeum commentaria fragmenta*, Neapoli 1964
- Sodano 1964b A.R. Sodano, "Grammatica e filologia nel commento di Porfirio al Timeo di Platone," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 92 (1964) pp. 40-58
- Solmsen 1931 F. Solmsen, "Demetrios, Περὶ ἑρμηνείας und sein peripatetisches Quellenmaterial," *Hermes* 66 (1931) pp. 241-67 = *Rhetorika: Kleine Schriften zur aristotelischen und hellenistischen Rhetorik*, ed. R. Stark, Hildesheim 1968 pp. 285-311.
- Steinhart 1873 K. Steinhart, *Platon's Leben*, Leipzig 1873
- Steinmetz 1969 P. Steinmetz, "Die Krise der Philosophie in der Zeit der Hochhellenismus," *Antike und Abendland* 15 (1969) pp. 122-134

- Steinthal 1890 H. Steinthal, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern*, I, Berlin 1890 = Hildesheim 1961
- Stroux 1912 J. Stroux, *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi*, Leipzig 1912
- Sudhaus 1906 S. Sudhaus, "Der Mimos von Oxyrhynchos," *Hermes* 41 (1906) pp. 247-77
- Susemihl 1891 F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I, Leipzig 1891 = Hildesheim 1965 (on Praxiphanes pp. 144-46)
- Susemihl 1892 F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, II, Leipzig 1892 = Hildesheim 1965
- Tarn 1969 W.W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, Chicago 1969
- Tarn 1978 W.W. Tarn, *La civiltà ellenistica*, Firenze 1978 (original title *Hellenistic Civilization*, London 1927 & 1952³)
- Theiler 1982 Poseidonios, *Die Fragmente*, hrsg. von W. Theiler, I (Texte), II (Erläuterung), Berlin-New York 1982
- Tréheux 1992 J. Tréheux, *Inscriptions de Délos*, I, *Les étrangers, à l'exclusion des Athéniens de la clérouchie et des Romains*, Paris 1992
- Tosi 1994 R. Tosi, "La lessicografia e la paremiografia in età alessandrina e il loro sviluppo successivo," in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, ed. F. Montanari, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 40, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994 pp. 143-197, 198-209 (Discussion)
- Tulli 2007 M. Tulli, "Filosofia e commedia nella biografia di Aspasia," in Erler - Schorn 2007 pp. 303-17
- Tuplin 1993-94 C. Tuplin, "The Reputation of Thycydides: a note on fr. 18," *Archaiognosia* 8 (1993-94) pp. 181-97
- Turner 1947 J.H. Turner, "The Meaning of Friendship in Epicurean Doctrines," *The Classical Journal* 42 (1947) pp. 351-55
- Ucciardello 2006 G. Ucciardello, s.v. Seleucus [3] Homericus, in *LGGA* (5/09/06)
- Usener 1858 H. Usener *Analecta Theophrastea*, Lipsiae 1858 = *Kleine Schriften* 1, Leipzig 1912 pp. 50-87
- Usener-Radermacher 1904-1939 *Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula*, edd. H. Usener et L. Radermacher, II, Lipsiae 1904-1939
- Van Bennekom 1975 R. Van Bennekom, "The definition of σύνδεσμος and ἄρθρον in Aristotle, *Poetics*, Ch. 20," *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975) pp. 399-411
- van Leeuwen 1917 *Odysea*, ed. J.F. van Leeuwen, Leiden 1917
- Van Ophuijsen - van Raalte 1998 see (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections, RUSCH 8
- Vial 1984 C. Vial, "Délos indépendante," *Bulletin de Corrispondance Hellénique* Suppl. 5 (1984)
- Visconti 1811 E.Q. Visconti, *Iconographie grecque*, I, Paris 1811
- Volkmann 1885 R. Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht*, Leipzig 1885

40 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Wachsmuth 1958 *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologii libri duo priores*, rec. C. Wachsmuth 1958
- Waeschke 1874 H. Waeschke, *De Aristarchi Studiis Hesiodis*, in *Acta seminarii regii et societatis philologicae Lipsiensis*, Lipsiae 1874 pp. 151-72
- Walsdorff 1927 F. Walsdorff, *Die antiken Urteile über Platons Stil*, Bonn 1927
- Warren 2004 J. Warren, *Facing Death: Epicurus and His Critics*, Oxford 2004
- Wehrli see (a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections
- Wehrli 1983 F. Wehrli, *Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, in Flashar 1983 pp. 461-599 (on Praxiphanes § 27 pp. 567-68)
- Wehrli - Wöhrle - Zhmund 2004 F. Wehrli - G. Wöhrle - L. Zhmund, *Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, in Flashar 2004 (on Praxiphanes § 26 pp. 602-03)
- Wendland 1898 *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, III, edidit P. Wendland, Berolini 1898
- Westermann 1845 A. Westermann, ΒΙΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ. *Vitarum Scriptores Graeci Minores*, Braunschweig 1845 = Amsterdam 1964
- Wilamowitz 1877 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Die Thukydideslegende," *Hermes* 12 (1877) pp. 326-67 = *Kleine Schriften* III, Berlin 1969 pp. 1-40
- Wilamowitz 1919 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Platon*, I-II, Berlin 1919
- Wilamowitz 1924 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, I-II, Berlin 1924
- Wilamowitz 1928 *Hesiodos Erga*, erklärt von U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Berlin 1928
- Wilhelm 1905 see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Inscriptiones: IG 11.4
- Willis-Dorandi^a see (b) Ancient and Medieval Sources, Praxiphanes: Willis-Dorandi^a
- Zeller 1921 E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, II 2, *Aristoteles und die alten Peripatetiker*, Leipzig 1921⁴ (on Praxiphanes p. 899 n. 4, p. 900 n. 1)
- Zeller 1923 E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, III.1, *Die nacharistotelische Philo-sophie*, Erste Hälfte, Leipzig 1923⁶
- Ziegler 1934 K. Ziegler, s.v. Theon 15, *RE*, Zweite Reihe 5 (1934) coll. 2075.30-2080.44
- Ziegler 1957 K. Ziegler, s.v. Prytanis nr. 5, *RE*, 23.1 (1957) coll. 1158.21-48

(d) Abbreviations used in the critical apparatus

add.	addidit / addiderunt	lin. / linn.	linea / lineae
ad loc.	ad locum	litt.	littera /litterae
ad v. / ad vv.	ad versum / ad versus	n. / nn.	nota / notae
adn.	adnotatio critica	om. / omm.	omisit / omiserunt
ap.	apud	p. / pp.	pagina / paginae
apogr.	apographum	pap.	papyrus
app.	apparatus criticus	prop.	proposuit
c.	caput	rec. / recc.	recensuit / recensuerunt
cens.	censuit	recogn.	recognovit
cf.	confer	s.v.	sub voce
col. / coll.	columna / columnae	schol.	scholium
cod. / codd.	codex / codices	scil.	scilicet
comm.	commentarium	secl./secll.	
e.g.	exempli gratia		seclusit / secluserunt
ed. / edd.	editor vel edidit / editores vel ediderunt	sqq.	sequentes
		ss.	suprascritpum
fr./ fr.	fragmentum / fragmenta	suppl. / suppll.	supplevi, supplevit / suppleverunt
γρ.	γράφεται		
i.e.	id est	T	testimonium / testimonia
in marg.	in margine	vid.	vide

(e) Symbols used in the apparatus

*	glossae in textu (in editione Latte, Hesych. Lexicon)
†	locus nondum sanatus
[α]	littera deleta
<α>	littera suppleta
<i>in papyris:</i>	
α	littera dubia vel mutila
[α]	littera deperdita ab editore suppleta
(α)	littera ab editore addita
[...]	lacuna ubi litterarum deperditarum numerus definiri potest
[- - -]	lacuna ubi litterarum deperditarum numerus definiri non potest

I. VITA

NOMEN (1-2)

- 1A** Πραξιφάνης Μιτυληναῖος] *Scholia Florentina in Callimachi Aetia I* νν. 1-12 (*PSI* 11.1219 fr. 1) = **10**; Callimachus ap. *Vitam Arati latinam* (adnotatio ad fr. 460 Pfeiffer) = **7**. Cf. *IG* 12 *Suppl.* 127.13-17 = ***16**.
- 1B** Πραξιφάνης Ῥόδιος] *PDuke* inv. G 178 col. 2.21 = **3A**; Strab. *Geographica* 14.2.13 = **13**; Epiph. *De fide* 9.35-39 = **19**.
- 1C** Πραξιφάνης Διονυσοφάνους Μιτυληναῖος] Clem. Alex. *Stromata* 1.16.79.3 = **9A**.
- 1D** Πραξιφάνης Διονυσιφάνους] *IG* 11.4 nr. 613 = **14**.
- *1E** ἐπὶ Πραξιφάνευσ] *Bullae ceramicae Rhodienses, Alexandriae* nrr. 157a, 157b = ***17A**, ***17B**.

I. LIFE

NAME (1-2)

- 1A** *Praxiphanes of Mytilene*] *Florentine scholia on Callimachus' Aetia I vv. 1-12* (PSI 11.1219 fr. 1) = **10**; Callimachus in the *Latin Life of Aratus* = **7**. Cf. IG 12 Suppl. 127 = ***16**.¹

¹ Praxiphanes is called *of Mytilene* also by other sources, see **1C**. This toponym shows that he was probably born in this Lesbian town. A Praxiphanes *of Mytilene* son of Damosthenes is mentioned in the inscription IG 12 Suppl. 127 = ***16**: the latter might have been a younger relative of the first.

- 1B** *Praxiphanes of Rhodes*] *Duke Papyrus* inv. G 178 col. 2. 21 = **3A**; Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.13 = **13**; Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35-39 = **19**.

- 1C** *Praxiphanes son of Dionysophanes of Mytilene*] Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.16 79.3 = **9A**.¹

¹ With reference to **1C-1D** Crönert 1906 p. 74 n. 355a first proposed recognizing our philosopher behind the two names *Praxiphanes son of Dionysophanes of Mytilene* (**9A**) and *Praxiphanes, son of Dionysiphanes* (**14**).

- 1D** *Praxiphanes, son of Dionysiphanes*] IG 11.4 nr. 613 = **14** Decree concerning the proxeny of Praxiphanes, son of Dionysiphanes in Delos.

- *1E** *in the year of Praxiphanes' archonship*] nr. 157a-b Neroutsos p. 242 = ***17A-*17B**.¹

¹ The name of a Praxiphanes as eponymous archon of Rhodes is printed on two amphora stamps of the Ptolemaic age, found at Alexandria. One of the two stamps adds "in the month of *Agrianios*." Neroutsos published the collection of amphora stamps of the Greek antiquarian Johannes Demetrios in 1874, but after Nilsson 1909 this collection seems to have been lost. It is not cited by Virginia Grace and it has not been (directly) considered by the authors of the recent lists of Rhodian eponyms. Unless contrary evidence appears, Neroutsos' reading of the name Praxiphanes (a *lectio difficilior*) cannot be excluded. I shall show why, despite the necessary criticism, nothing prevents connecting the name Praxiphanes of this Rhodian archon with that of our philosopher. See note on ***17A-B**.

44 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Filius eius fortasse

- *1F** Διονουσοφάεις Πραξιφάνεος] *IG* 7.1752.6-7 = ***15**, Dionu-
sophaeis, Praxiphanis filius, in virorum catalogo Thespiis.

Cognatus eius fortasse

- *1G** Πραξιφάνης Δαμοσθένει[ος] *IG* 12 *Suppl.* 127.13-17 = ***16**,
decretum de proxenia Praxiphani Mitylenaeo, Damosthenis filio,
Eresi data.

Nominis Praxiphanis compositio

- 2A** Theognostus, *Canones sive De orthographia* (nr. 569 p. 97.6-12 Cramer)

Τὰ παρὰ βαρύτονον μέλλοντα συγκείμενα διὰ τοῦ ι
γράφονται, ἢ διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ ε
ψιλοῦ· οῖον, στήσω, Στησίχορος· πράξω, Πραξιφάνης· λύσω,
Λυσίμαχος· μίξω, μιξόθηρ· μιξοπόλιος· μιξοβάρβαρος·
ὄρσω, ὀρσόθηριξ· ὀρσοθώραξ· δρύψω, δρυψόπαις· πέρσω,
περσεπόλις· κέρσω, κερσεκόμης· καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰδήσω 5
Οἰδησίπους, καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν τοῦ ης Οἰδίπους.

His Son?

***1F** *Dionousophaeis son of Praxiphanes*] IG 7.1752.6-7 = ***15**.¹

¹ Dionousophaeis, son of Praxiphanes in a military catalogue of *epheboi* in Thespieae: see the note on **15** where I argue that he can be the son of our Praxiphanes. Bechtel 1917 p. 138 (s.v. Διονυσιφάνης et Διονουσοφάεις) and Fraser-Matthews 1987 (p. 139, s.v. Διονουσοφάνης) show that the name Dionousophaeis is the same of Dionysophanes and of Dionysiphanes (see **1C** and **1D**), all written after different local dialects.

His Relative?

***1G** *Praxiphanes son of Damosthenes*] IG 12 Suppl. 127.13-17 = ***16**. A decree of the end of the 3rd century BC concerning the proxeny given to Praxiphanes, son of Damosthenes, made at Eresus (he is certainly not our philosopher, but perhaps a relative of his)

Composition of the Name Praxiphanes¹

2A Theognostus, *Canones or On Orthography* nr. 569

Names compounded from a not-oxytone (baritone) future are written with iota or omicron, sometimes also with epsilon, for example, from *stēsō*: *Stēsichorus* (chorus founder), from *praxō*: *Praxiphanēs* (doer of illustrious deeds²); from *lysō*: *Lysimachus* (fight solver); from *mixō*: *mixothēr* (beast-mixture), *mixopolios* (grey-mixture/ half-grey), *mixobarbaros* (barbarian-mixture / half barbarian); from *orsō*: *orsothrix* (raising the hair), *orsothōrax* (raising the breast); from *drypsō*: *drypsopais* (boy teaser); from *persō*: *Persepolis* (destroyer of cities); from *kersō*: *kersekomēs* (with the hair cut). In this way, then, there is also, from *oidēsō*, *Oidēsipous* and, with the syncopation (of *ēs*), *Oidipous* (Swollen footed).

¹ Since the name Praxiphanes is rare, the grammatical sources **2A-B** seem to take their examples only from the names of very well known personages, and our Praxiphanes was well known as ‘first grammarian,’ I think that the sources **2A-B** get the name ‘Praxiphanes’ from our philosopher.

² Pape 1875 p. 1249a (s.v. Praxiphanes 1) translates the name Praxiphanes ‘durch seine Rührigkeit oder Thätigkeit glänzend,’ but I do not agree with this interpretation because the source is here speaking about names whose meanings depend on the fact that every second element of a compound is syntactically subordinate to the first. For this reason I interpret the meaning of Praxiphanes not as ‘illustrious for his deeds,’ but as ‘doer of illustrious deeds.’

46 **Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea**

2B [Zonaras], *Lexicon* O s.v. Οἰδίπους (col. 1429.27 Tittmann)

Οἰδίπους. οἰδῶ, οἰδήσω, οἰδησίπους καὶ οἰδίπους διὰ τοῦ ι. τὰ γὰρ ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων μελλόντων γινόμενα διὰ τοῦ ι γράφεται, ἢ διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ ε ψιλοῦ. οἶον· στήσω, Στησίχορος· πράξω, Πραξιφάνης· μίξω, μιξόθριξ· πέρσω, Περσεφόνη. οὕτως οὖν καὶ οἰδήσω 5 Οἰδησίπους καὶ ἐν συγκοπῇ Οἰδίπους. οὕτω Θεόγνωστος.

IN SERIE PHILOSOPHORUM
PERIPATETICORUM (3A-C)

3A *PDuke* inv. G 178 col. 2.17-22 (pp. 81-82 Willis-Dorandi^a)

Περι]πατητικοί
Ἄ]ριστοτέλης Σταγειρίτ(ης)
Θεό]φ[ρ]αστος Ἴων
20 Στρά]των ἐκ Λαμψάκου
Πραξιφ]άνης [Ῥ]όδιος
Κριτόλ]αος Φα[σ]ηλίτης

Hoc testimonium inter alia de Praxiphane in papyris reperta edd. Willis-Dorandi^b nr. 86 T1 p. 639 (= T1 Willis-Dorandi^a). De papyro vid. etiam Willis 1978 nr. 2 pp. 146-51

19 *Theophrastus* 66 nr. 9 *FHS&G*

3B Epiphanius, *De fide* 9.35-39 (p. 508.4-15 Holl-Dummer) = **19**

Θεόφραστος Ἐρέσιος ... Στράτων ἐκ Λαμψάκου ...
Πραξιφάνης Ῥόδιος ... Κριτόλαος ὁ Φασηλίτης ...

2B Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon s.v. Oidipous*

Oidipous. (From) *Oidō* and *oidēsō* (are compounded) *Oidēsipous* and *Oidipous* with the iota (as compound vowel). Words resulting from futures with not-oxytone (baritone) accent are written with the iota, or with omicron, and sometimes with epsilon. For example, from *stēsō*: *Stēsichorus* (chorus founder), from *praxō*: *Praxiphanēs* (doer of illustrious deeds); from *mixō*: *mixothrix* (having mixed hair); from *persō*: *Persephoneia* (destroyer through murder). In this way, then, there is also, from *oidēsō*, *Oidesipous* and, with the syncopation (of *ēs*), *Oidipous* (Swollen footed). So (says) Theognostus.

CATALOGUES OF PERIPATETIC
PHILOSOPHERS (3A-C)

3A Duke Papyrus, inv. G 178 col. 2.17-22

Peripatetics
Aristotle of Stagira
Theophrastus the Ionian
20 Strato of Lampsacus
Praxiphanes of Rhodes
Critolaus of Phaselis¹

¹ This list of philosophers, whose names are accompanied by an ethnic designation, is written on a papyrus of the 4th cent. AD, which comes from the Egyptian Archive of Ammon (who was probably the scribe). It lists scholars of different philosophical schools. The list of Peripatetics is different from other doxographies, but is the same as the one given by Epiphanius (**3B = 19**): see the commentary of Willis-Dorandi^a pp. 83-88). About Theophrastus, Strato and Critolaus see notes on **3C**.

3B Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35-39 = 19

Theophrastus of Eresus... Strato of Lampsacus
Praxiphanes of Rhodes, Critolaus of Phaselis...¹

¹ This list of Peripatetic philosophers is the same as the one given by Ammon in *PDuke* inv. G 178 (**3A**): they probably both depend on a common source of the 3rd-4th centuries AD (see the commentary of Willis-Dorandi^a pp. 83-88).

48 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

3C Hesychius, *Vita Aristotelis* 9 (p. 98.19-21 Dorandi)

3W διάδοχοι δ' αὐτοῦ (Ἀριστοτέλους) τῆς σχολῆς κατὰ τάξιν ἐγένοντο οἶδε· Θεόφραστος, Στράτων, Πραξιτέλης, Λύκων, Ἀρίστων, Λυκίσκος, Πραξιφάνης, Ἱερώνυμος, Πρύτανις, Φορμίων, Κριτόλαος.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam Preller p. 8, T2a Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

1-4 *Arist. TII* Rose 1886 p. 10.19-22 = *Düring* 1957 p. 82 § 9 et *Gigon* pp. 26.33-36 2 *Theophrastus* 11 nr. 7 *FHS&G* *Strato* fr. 3 *Wehrli* = 5B *Sharples* *Lyco* fr. 6 *Wehrli* = nr. 3B *SFOD* 2004 3 *Aristo* fr. 7 *Wehrli* = nr. 4A *SFOD* 2006 3 *Hieronymus* fr. 2 *Wehrli* = 3B *White* 4 *Critolaus* fr. 3 *Wehrli*

2 Πραξιτέλης : Πασικλῆς *Preller* : *delendum cens. Rose*

THEOPHRASTI AUDITOR ET SODALIS (4A-*D)

4A Πραξιφάνης δὲ ὁ τοῦ Θεοφράστου ἐταῖρος] *Proclus, In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria* I (17a) 5 c (p. 14.20-28 *Diehl*) = **23A**

1 *Theophrastus* 18 nr. 17 *FHS&G*

4B καὶ Πραξιφάνης ὁ τοῦ Θεοφράστου μαθητῆς] *Proclus, Commentaria in Hesiodi Opera*, *Proleg. Ac* (p. 2.7-20 *Pertusi*) = **28A**

1 *Theophrastus* 18 nr. 17 *FHS&G*

4C Πραξιφάνης ὁ μαθητῆς Θεοφράστου] *Tzetzes, In Hesiodi Opera et Dies Commentarium*, app. *Proleg. Ac* (p. 1 *Pertusi*) = **28B**

1 *Theophrastus* 18 nr. 17 *FHS&G*

3C Hesychius of Miletus, *Life of Aristotle* 9 (Dorandi p. 98.19-21)

Successors in his school¹ were in order the following: Theophrastus, Strato,² Praxiteles,³ Lyco,⁴ Aristo,⁵ Lyciscus,⁶ Praxiphanes, Hieronymus,⁷ Prytanis,⁸ Phormio,⁹ Critolaus.¹⁰

¹ On the different meanings of *scholē* (school), *diatribē* (seminar) and *hairesis* (sect) see Glucker 1978 pp. 160-174.

² Wehrli 1983 pp. 569-74 (§ 28 *Straton von Lampsakos*).

³ The name of a Peripatetic Praxiteles is absent from the list of scholars in Wehrli 1983 and Wehrli – Wöhrle – Zhmud 2004.

⁴ Wehrli 1983 pp. 576-77 (§ 29C *Lykon aus Troas*).

⁵ Wehrli 1983 pp. 579-82 (§ 30A *Ariston von Keos*).

⁶ The name of a Peripatetic Lyciscus is absent from the list of scholars in Wehrli 1983 and in Wehrli – Wöhrle – Zhmud 2004.

⁷ Wehrli 1983 pp. 575-76 (§ 29B *Hieronymos aus Rhodos*).

⁸ Ziegler s.v. Prytanis nr. 5 in *RE* 23.1 (1957) c. 1158.21-48, cf. Kassel 1985a pp. 23-4; Wehrli 1983 p. 582 (§ 30B *Prytanis und Phormion*).

⁹ Brink s.v. Phormion nr. 8 in *RE* 20.1(1941) cc. 540.35-57; Wehrli 1983 *ibidem*.

¹⁰ Wehrli 1983 pp. 588-89 (§ 32A *Kritolaos von Phaselis*).

PUPIL AND FRIEND OF THEOPHRASTUS (4A-*D)

4A Proclus, *Commentary on Plato*, *Timaeus* 1 5c (p. 14.20-28 Diehl) = **23A**

... and Praxiphanes, Theophrastus' friend ...

4B Proclus, *Commentary on Hesiod's Works and Days Preface* (p. 2.7-20 Pertusi) = **28A**

... and Praxiphanes, Theophrastus' pupil ...

4C Tzetzes, *Commentary on Hesiod's Works Preface* (app. p. 1 Pertusi) = **28B**

... Praxiphanes, Theophrastus' pupil ...¹

¹ **4A-C** About Praxiphanes' scholarship and friendship with Theophrastus, see Preller 1842 pp. 5-6, Zeller 1921 (II.2) p. 899 n. 4.

50 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- *4D Fuit fortasse Praxiphanes inter Theophrasti discipulos, qui de elementis vel partibus sermonis scripserunt: cf. Porphyrium ap. Simplicium, *In Aristotelis Categorias*, Prooemium (CAG 8 pp. 10.19-11.2 = *Theophr. 683 FHS&G*) καθὸ μὲν γὰρ λέξεις, ἄλλας ἔχουσι πραγματείας, ἃς ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων ὃ τε Θεόφραστος ἀνακινεῖ καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν γεγραφότες = *32

Eadem de cosmologia et metaphysicis
Praxiphanes et Theophrastus censuerunt
Aristotetelem secuti

- 5 Epiphanius, *De fide* 9.35-39 (p. 508.4-15 Holl-Dummer) = 19

2W Θεόφραστος Ἐρέσιος τὰ αὐτὰ Ἀριστοτέλει ἐδόξασε...
Πραξιφάνης Ῥόδιος τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Θεοφράστῳ ἐδόξασε

DE PRAXIPHANIS DISCIPULIS (6-8)

An Epicurus?

- 6 Apollodorus ap. Diogenem Laertium, *Vitae philosophorum* 10.13 (p. 718.10-12 Marcovich)

5W τοῦτον (Ἐπίκουρον) Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν Χρονικοῖς Ναυσιφάνους ἀκοῦσαί φησι καὶ Πραξιφάνους· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐ φησιν, ἀλλ' ἐαυτοῦ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Εὐρύλοχον ἐπιστολῇ.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T4 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

1 Apollodorus fr. 75 Jacoby p. 354 (= 244 fr. 41 FGrHist) Epicurus fr. 123 Usener p. 140.8-9 et p. 365.19-21 = 13.1-3 Diano p. 78; [1] 13 p. 11.12-13 et [48] [1] 13 1 Arrighetti p. 425; Laks p. 14.25-27 Nausiphanes 75 DK A 8 (= Leucippus 67 DK A2)

1 Ναυσιφάνους : Λυσιφάνους *FP*⁴ ss. γρ.: καὶ Πραξιφάνους *secll. Jacoby 1902 p. 354* (= 244 fr. 41 FGrHist) et Crönert pp. 21 et 175 (21) 3 ἐν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ *F* Εὐρύλοχον *Menagius ex Diogene Laertio, Vitae Philos. 10.28* : εὐρύδοκον *BFP*⁴ : εὐρύλοκον *P¹Q* : Εὐρύδικον *D*

- *4D** Porphyry, in the introduction to Simplicius, *On Aristotle's Categories* (CAG, 8 pp. 10.19-11.2 Kalbfleisch 1907 = Theophr. 683 FHS&G) = ***32**

... For insofar as they are expressions, they belong to other objects, which are worked up by Theophrastus in his work *On the Elements of Speech*, and by his associates ...¹

¹ Praxiphanes' closeness to Theophrastus (testified by **4A-C** and **5**) and his grammatical interests (see **9A-C**) lead me to see him as one of the Theophrastean pupils who wrote about elements of speech (see notes on ***32**).

Praxiphanes Shared Theophrastus' Cosmological Theories in Continuity with Aristotle's Teachings

- 5** Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35-39 = **19**

Theophrastus of Eresus held the same opinions as Aristotle... Praxiphanes of Rhodes held the same opinions as Theophrastus.¹

¹ See the note on **19**.

THE PUPILS (6-8)

Epicurus?

- 6** Apollodorus, in Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 10.13 (Marcovich 1999 p. 718.10-12)¹

Apollodorus in his *Chronology*² says that this (Epicurus) was a pupil of Nausiphanes and of Praxiphanes; but in his *Letter to Eurylochus*, Epicurus himself denies it and says that he was his own pupil.³

¹ See discussions in Harles 1793 p. 503, Preller 1842 pp. 6-7, Steinhart 1873 p. 268 (nr. 50), Hirzel 1877 p. 165, Usener 1887 p. 416 (s.v. Πραξιφάνης), Susemihl 1891 pp. 89-90 n. 397^b p. 145 n. 738, Jacoby 1902 p. 354 nn. 2-3, Crönert 1906 pp. 21, 175 n. 21, Bignone 1920 (1964) p. 202 et n. 2, Zeller 1923 (III.1) pp. 374-75 [p. 364] et n. 2, Bignone 1936 (1973²) I pp. 420-22 et nn. 82-83, 430-31 n. 104, Aly 1954 coll. 1771.67-1772.6 and coll. 1784.33-40 (s.v. Praxiphanes 2), Wehrli (Prax.) p. 106, De Witt 1973 pp. 13, 36, 46, 51, 56-60, Laks 1977 pp. 66-68, Isnardi Parente 1983² p. 107 and n. 2 p. 115 et nn. 1, 2, Capasso 1988 pp. 56-58, Rossetti-Furiani 1993 p. 674, Gigante 1999 p. 121.

² About Apollodorus of Athens (c. 180-after 120 BC) collaborator of Aristarchus in Alexandria and a scholar of great learning and varied interests, see Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 252-66.

³ Some scholars assert but many others deny the reliability of Diogenes

An Callimachus et Aratus?

7 Callimachus ap. *Vitam Arati latinam* (fr. 460 p. 352 Pfeiffer)

^{17W} Factus est autem nimis multum litteratus vir, sicut testatur Callimachus adsistens ei ab infantia propter Praxiphanem Mitylenum.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T5b Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De textu vid. Maass p. 149 col. b linn. 1-5, Martin Vita 3 p. 16 col. a linn. 12-17. Callimachus Aratum laudavit in eis quae scripsit in Praxiphanem (vid. 11), cf. etiam Arati Vitam graecam 3 (Martin p. 16 col. b linn. 12-14) ἐγένετο δὲ σφόδρα πολυγράμματος ἀνὴρ, ὥς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Καλλίμαχος

Plato Peripateticus

8 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 3.109 (p. 255.2-6 Marcovich)

^{6W} Γέγονε δὲ καὶ ἄλλος Πλάτων φιλόσοφος Ῥόδιος, μαθητὴς Παναιτίου, καθά φησι Σέλευκος ὁ γραμματικὸς

Laertius' information from Apollodorus about Epicurus as a pupil or listener of Praxiphanes, for many different reasons, but primarily the chronology. The scholarship argues that Praxiphanes was at least contemporary with Epicurus (so Bignone 1936 = 1973² I pp. 420-21). Scholars who give credibility to this information discuss where Epicurus might have attended Praxiphanes' lectures, whether in Athens (Preller 1842 pp. 6-7), Mytilene (Bignone 1920 = 1964 p. 202 and n. 2), or Rhodes (De Witt 1973 pp. 36-37, 46). The relationship between Epicurus and Praxiphanes is probably only a doxographical construction. Nevertheless Laks 1976 pp. 66-68, Capasso 1984 pp. 406-07 and Capasso 1988 p. 58 underline the important interest (even if polemic) showed by Epicureans in Praxiphanes, as testified by **20a-e** and **27**.

Callimachus and Aratus?

7 Callimachus, in the *Latin Life of Aratus* (fr. 460 p. 352 Pfeiffer)¹

He (Aratus) became, however, an exceptional literary man, as Callimachus attests, who assisted him from his early youth because of Praxiphanes of Mytilene.²

¹ See discussions in Susemihl 1891 pp. 287-88 n. 10, Rohde 1914 pp. 106-8 n. 3, Rostagni 1928 p. 21, Herter 1931 col. 388.16-39, Delage 1940 p. 95, Brink 1946 pp. 13 and 25-26, Pfeiffer 1949 p. 352, Aly 1954 coll. 1770.4-1771.65, Wehrli (Prax.) pp. 111-12, Capasso 1984 pp. 397-98 n. 35, Cameron 1995 p. 210.

² The attractive idea that Aratus and Callimachus might have frequented Praxiphanes' lectures is in recent times accepted by scholars such as Calboli 1998 pp. 53-54 and Haake 2007 p. 249. But the reliability of the statements of this Latin source was put in question some time ago by scholars who suspected that this text might be corrupt (Herter 1931 col. 388.16-39) or that the Latin translation misunderstood the original Greek biography written by Theon, where (in a passage full of gaps) we can only read "Aratus was a man of great knowledge, as Callimachus attests" (*Vita Graeca Arati* 3, p. 16 col. b lines 12-14 Martin), vid. Maass 1883 pp. 38-42, Brink 1946 p. 13. At any rate, a relationship among Aratus, Callimachus and Praxiphanes is testified also by **11** and we cannot rule it out. Scholars wonder whether they met in Athens, in Rhodes, or Alexandria.

Plato the Peripatetic

8 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 3.109¹

There was also another Rhodian philosopher named Plato, a student of Panaetius, as Seleucus the grammarian says in his

54 **Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea**

έν πρώτῳ Περὶ φιλοσοφίας· καὶ ἄλλος, περιπατητικός, μαθητὴς Ἀριστοτέλους· καὶ ἕτερος Πραξιφάνους· καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας ποιητής. 5

De Praxiphane vid. etiam LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

1-3 *Panaetius T45 Alesse Seleucus Alexandrinus FHG 3 p. 500 col. a, LGGA s.v. Seleucus [3] Homericus 5 Plato comicus T13 PCG 7 p. 433*

4 Πραξιφάνους : Πραξιφάνης *F*

**PRAXIPHANES, PRIMUS GRAMMATICORUM,
QUI VERE PROPRIEQUE DICUNTUR (9A-C)**

9A Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.16.79.3 (p. 51.17-22 Stählin-Früchtel-Treu)

10 W Ἀντίδωρος δὲ ὁ Κυμαῖος πρῶτος <τοῦ γραμματικοῦ ἀντὶ> τοῦ κριτικοῦ εἰσηγήσατο τὸ ὄνομα καὶ γραμματικὸς προσηγορεύθη, ἔνιοι δὲ Ἐρατοσθένη τὸν Κυρηναῖόν φασιν, ἐπειδὴ ἐξέδωκεν οὗτος βιβλία δύο Γραμματικά ἐπιγράψας. ὠνομάσθη δὲ γραμματικός, ὥς νῦν ὀνομάζομεν, πρῶτος 5 Πραξιφάνης Διονυσοφάνους Μιτυληναῖος.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T8 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes Alia editio adhibita: Meier pp. 18-19 et n. 54

3 *Eratosthenes FGrHist IIB 241 T8*

1 Ἀντίδωρος *maluit Pfeiffer 1968 p. 158, quem sequor : Ἀντίδωρος vel Ἀντόδωρος Schol. Dionys. Thr. (Proleg. Voss., Hilgard p. 3.24-26; Proleg. Lond., Hilgard p. 448.5-6) : Ἀπολλόδωρος codd. et edd. Κυμμαῖος L 1-2 <τοῦ γραμματικοῦ ἀντὶ> Meier p. 19 n. 54 5 ἐπιγράψας <ὠνομάσθαι οὕτως πρῶτον> Meier ibidem*

first book *On Philosophy*; and there was another, a Peripatetic, a student of Aristotle; and another, (a student) of Praxiphanes; and there was Plato, the poet of old comedy.²

¹ Discussions in Preller 1842 p. 6, Crönert 1906 p. 180, Schmidt 1950a col. 2542.36-42, Schmidt 1950b col. 2542.43-44, Schmidt 1950d col. 2542.45-46, Aly 1954 col. 1770.40-42, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 106, Alesse 1997 pp. 178-79.

² We do not know who this Peripatetic Plato was. But I note his epithet as ‘student’ of Praxiphanes because it testifies that he had pupils in a school. No other source says that specifically.

CONSIDERED THE FIRST ACTUAL ‘GRAMMARIAN’ (9A-C)

9A Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.16.79.3¹

Antidorus of Cyme² was the first to introduce and be known by the name “grammarian” rather than “critic,”³ but some say that Eratosthenes of Cyrene (was the first),⁴ since he published two books entitled *Grammatics*. But Praxiphanes son of Dionysophanes of Mytilene was the first to have been called ‘grammarian’ in our sense.⁵

¹ Discussions in Classen 1829 p. 8, Preller 1842 pp. 5, 8-15, Susemihl 1891, I p. 145 n. 739, Susemihl 1892, II p. 664, Aly 1954 coll. 1777.51-1779.4, Pfeiffer 1968 p. 158 et n. 2, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 108, Nicolai 1992 pp. 178-86, Harles 1993 p. 503, Tosi 1994 p. 146 n. 3, Manetti-Montanari 1999 p. 651, Schenkeveld-Barnes 1999 p. 221.

² The codices write Apollodorus but I prefer the correction of this name to Antidorus following the interpretation of Pfeiffer 1968 p. 158 who recalls *Schol. Dionys. Thr.* p. 3.24-26 and p. 448.6-7 Hilgard, where Antidorus of Cyme is said to be a grammarian of the 4th cent. BC who wrote about style and *Commentaries* on Homer and Hesiod. We do not know any Apollodorus of Cyme. Another grammarian named Apollodorus was from Athens and lived in the 2nd cent. BC (see note on 6).

³ About the first *grammatikoi*, *kritikoi*, and *philologoi* see Steinthal 1891 pp. 13-25; Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 156-59; Baratin-Desbordes 1981 pp. 9-67; Nicolai 1992 pp. 178-97; Schenkeveld 1993, Dihle 1998.

⁴ Eratosthenes of Cyrene (c. 275-194 BC) was a pupil of Callimachus and succeeded Apollonius of Rhodes as head of the Alexandrian Library. He wrote on geography, literary criticism, chronology, mathematics, and philosophy, and was also a poet (Fraser 1996 s.v. Eratosthenes pp. 553-54, Geus 2002). He pretended to be called ‘philologist’ (φιλόλογος), not ‘grammarian’ (γραμματικός), see Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 158-70.

⁵ As 9B and 9C confirm, Praxiphanes was considered the founder of a new kind of grammar that dealt with the critical exegesis of texts (see Dion. Thr. *Ars*

9B *Scholium Vaticanum in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* 1 (p. 164.23-29 Hilgard)

9W διττὴ δέ ἐστιν ἡ γραμματική· ἡ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας καὶ τὰς τῶν στοιχείων ἐκφωνήσεις καταγίνεται, ἥτις καὶ γραμματικὴ λέγεται, παλαιὰ οὖσα καὶ πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ ἅμα τῇ φύσει προελθοῦσα· ἡ δὲ περὶ τὸν ἑλληνισμόν, ἥτις καὶ νεωτέρα 5 ἐστίν, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ Θεαγένους, τελεσθεῖσα δὲ παρὰ τῶν Περιπατητικῶν Πραξιφάνους τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους. καὶ τῆς μὲν [γραμματικῆς] τέλος τὸ εὖ ἀναγινώσκειν, τῆς δὲ [γραμματικῆς] τὸ εὖ γράφειν.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T9a Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

6 *Theagenes* 8 *DK 1a* *De grammaticae definitionibus: Dionysius Thrax, Ars grammatica* 1 (*Uhlig pp. 5.1-6.3*) Γραμματικὴ ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἕξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβῆς κατὰ προσῳδίαν, δεῦτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὗρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὲ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ *De grammaticis: Dio Chrysost. Orat. 53* (*De Budé pp. 141.17-142.1*), *Sext. Emp. Adversus mathematicos* 1.79 (= *Crates Mall. F94 Broggiato*) et 1.248 (= *Crates Mall. T20 Broggiato*)

6 Θεαγένους Σ¹ Θεογένους *Cb* : *de Theodecte cogitabat Classen* 1829 p. 9 n.* 6 δὲ *om. C* περὶ *C* 7 Πραξιφάνους Σ¹ παρὰ Ἐξιφάνους *C* παρ' Ἐξιφάνους *b* 8 γραμματικῆς *om. b, seclusi* 9 γραμματικῆς *om. b, seclusi*

9C *Scholium Londinense in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* 1 (p. 448.12-16 Hilgard)

8W διαφέρει δὲ γραμματικὴ γραμματιστικῆς· ἡ γὰρ γραμματικὴ νεωτέρα ἀπὸ Θεαγένους, τετέλεσται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Περιπατητικῶν Πραξιφάνους τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους· ἡ

Grammatica 1 pp. 5.1-6.3 and note on **9C**). It was different from grammar as a collection of rules for good reading and writing. Pfeiffer 1968 p. 158 and 162 suspected that Asclepiades of Myrleia, a pupil of Dionysius Thrax, might have been the source of this passage. Blank 1998 pp. 115-16 disagrees.

9B Vatican Scholium on Dionysius Thrax' *Grammatical Art* 1¹

Grammar is of two kinds. One concerns the shapes and sounds of the letters, which is called *grammatikē*, being old, even before the Trojan war, having come into being pretty well at the same time as the nature (of speech). The other concerns Greekness (i.e. grammatical correctness), which is newer, having begun with Theagenes² and reached its final form with the Peripatetics Aristotle and Praxiphanes. And the goal of the first is good reading, of the latter good writing.³

¹ See discussions in Preller 1842 p. 5, 9-15, Schoemann 1862 p. 9 n. 1, Christ-Schmid 1920 p. 80, Laqueur 1934 col. 1347.34-69, Aly 1954 coll. 1777.51-1779.4, Pfeiffer 1968 p. 158, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 108, Blank 1998 pp. 115-16, Manetti-Montanari 1999 p. 651.

² Theagenes of Rhegium, grammarian and Homeric critic bloomed in the last quarter of the 6th cent. BC. See Laqueur 1934 col. 1347.34-69; Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 9-12.

³ Aristotle, *Top.* 6.5 (139b24-142b35), criticizes those who define grammar as "the knowledge of writing from dictation," adding that grammar is also knowledge of reading.

9C London Scholium on Dionysius Thrax' *Grammatical Art* 1¹

Grammatikē differs from *grammatistikē*: *grammatikē* is newer, since the time of Theagenes, and reached its final form with the Peripatetics Praxiphanes and Aristotle.²

δὲ γραμματιστικὴ παλαιά, ἴσως δὲ σχεδὸν ἅμα τῇ φύσει
προελθοῦσα. καὶ τῆς μὲν τέλος τὸ γράφειν, τῆς δὲ τὸ
ἀναγινώσκειν.

5

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T9b Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

1-6 *De grammatica et grammatistica tractat Philo, De congressu eruditionis gratia 148* τό γε μὴν γράφειν καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν γραμματικῆς τῆς ἀτελεστέρας ἐπάγγελμα, ἣν παρατρέποντές τινες γραμματιστικὴν καλοῦσι, τῆς δὲ τελειοτέρας ἀνάπτυξις τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν (*pergit in De congressu eruditionis gratia 149, vid. app. *32*), *Sext. Emp. Adversus mathematicos 1.44* (= *Crates Mall. T7 Broggiato*) *et 1.47, 52, 53, 54, 56* 2 *Theagenes 8 DK 1a* 5-6 *Arist. Top. 6.5 (142b31-35)* Ἐπεὶ εἰ πρὸς πλείω λεγομένου τοῦ ὀριζομένου μὴ πρὸς πάντα ἀποδέδωκεν, οἷον εἰ τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐπιστήμην τοῦ γράψαι τὸ ὑπαγορευθέν· προσδεῖται γὰρ ὅτι καὶ τοῦ ἀναγνῶναι. οὐδὲν γὰρ μᾶλλον <ὁ> τοῦ γράψαι ἢ <ὁ> τοῦ ἀναγνῶναι ἀποδοὺς ὥρισταί, ὥστ' οὐδέτερος, ἀλλ' ὁ ἄμφω ταῦτ' εἰπών, ἐπειδὴ πλείους οὐκ ἐνδέχεται ταῦτοῦ ὀρισμοῦς εἶναι

5 τὸ τέλος A

IN PRAXIPHANEM VARIA IUDICIA (10-13)

Praxiphanes inter Telchines in Callimachi Aetiis

10 *Scholia Florentina in Callimachi Aetia I vv. 1-12, PSI 11.1219 fr. 1 (pp. 62-63 Massimilla)*

15W [...]. μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῇ
[litt. circ. 22]τει. δ[...].
[litt. circ. 14]. Διονυσίοις δυ[σ]ί, τῷ ἐλ
[litt. circ. 12]νι κ(αὶ) τῷ ἰλειονι κ(αὶ) Ἀσκλη-
5 [πιάδῃ τῷ Σικελίδῃ κ(αὶ) Ποσειδίππῳ τῷ ονο-
[litt. circ. 12] .υρίππῳ τῷ ῥήτορι κ(αὶ) Ἀνα-
[litt. circ. 12]βῳ κ(αὶ) Πραξιφάνῃ τῷ Μιτυ-
ληναίῳ, τοῖς με]μφομ(έν)οι]ς αὐτοῦ τὸ κάτισ-
[χνον τῶν ποιη]μάτ(ων) κ(αὶ) ὅτι οὐχὶ μῆκος ἤρα
10 [.....].[.....]ουμ(εν)ο.[.]οι.[...].
[...].ων λου.[.]ο.[.]πα..[....]
παρα]τίθεται τε ἐν σ(υ)γκρίσει τὰ ὀλίγων στί-

Grammatistikē is old perhaps coming into being at the same time as the nature (of speech). The goal of the former is to write, of the latter to read.

¹ See notes to **9B**.

² Philo, *On Meeting for the Sake of Seeking Instruction* 148, calls *grammatistikē* “a lower stage of grammar,” which undertakes to teach reading and writing, while the task of the higher stage, called *grammatikē*, is the elucidation of the writings of the poets and prose-writers and has to do with philosophy. § 149 connects closely with the contents of ***32**.

JUDGMENTS ON PRAXIPHANES (10-13)

Praxiphanes among the Telchines in Callimachus’ *Aetia*

10 Scholium on Callimachus, *Causes* 1 PSI 11.1219, fr. 1¹

“The Telchines² murmured against my song”³ [36 letter gap] . . . to the two Dionysuses [12 letter gap] . . . to the gracious (god) to.... and to Asclepiades of Sicily⁴ and to Posidippus the⁵ [12 letter gap] to (P)yrrippus,⁶ the rhetor, and to Ana- [12 letter gap] -bo and to Praxiphanes the Mytilenean,⁷ who found fault with the slightness of his poems and that the length was not (*c. 50 letters unreadable*), he places in comparison the poems of a few verses by Mimnermus of Colophon⁸ and Philitas of Cos,⁹ saying that they are better than their poems of many lines.

¹ Papyrus of the 2nd cent. AD (by Bastianini 2006 p. 152). Catalogued in Pack² nr. 196 (= MP³ nr. 196) and LDAB nr. 498.

See discussions in Rostagni 1927 pp. 172-73, Rostagni 1928 pp. 172-73, Edwards 1930 pp. 109-12, Gallavotti 1932 pp. 232-33, Coppola 1932 pp. 333-34, Coppola 1932-33, Pohlenz 1933 pp. 319-20, Rostagni 1933 pp. 189-210: 196-198, Cataudella 1934 pp. 56-57, Cahen 1935 p. 286, Coppola 1935 pp. 229-30, Körte 1935, Diehl 1937 pp. 418-21, Herter 1937 pp. 108-09, Maas 1937, p. 159-60, Delage 1940 p. 95,

[χ(ων) ὄν]τ(α) ποιήματα Μιμνέρμου τοῦ Κο-
[λοφω]νίου καὶ) Φιλίτα τοῦ Κώου βελτίονα
15 τ(ῶν) πολυστίχων αὐτ(ῶν) φάσκων εἶναι [...]

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T6 Brink, 4T Manetti-Montanari pp. 647-51, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De textu vid. Norsa-Vitelli 1933 pp. 123-32 (= Norsa Vitelli¹), Coppola 1932-33, Norsa-Vitelli 1935 pp. 139-49 (= Norsa Vitelli²), Pfeiffer 1 p. 3 (Schol Flor. ad fr. 1.1-12), Van Rossum-Steenbeek 1998 pp. 273-274 nr. 44, Bastianini 2006 pp. 152-166

1-15 *cf. Callim. Aetia I fr. 1 (Massimilla p. 57.1-7)]* μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ᾠοιδῇ, / νήιδε]ς οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι, / εἵνεκε]ν οὐχ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ]η /]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἥ[νυσα χιλιάσιν / ἢ]ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλ[ίσσω / παῖς ᾗ]ε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκά[ς] οὐκ ὀλίγη. /].] και Τε[λ]χῖσιν ἐγὼ τόδε· κτλ *De Telchinibus etiam Callim. Aet. I fr. 1.7, III fr. 75.65, Hymn. IV.31 4-5 Asclepiades T4 Sens 5 Posidippus T5 Austin - Bastianini 7-8 Πραξιφάνη τῷ Μιτυλληναίῳ vid. 11 8 τοῖς με]μφομ(έν)οις αὐτοῦ cf. Schol. IX.34-33 in Callim. Ia. XIII, fr. 203 Pfeiffer 1 p. 205 8-9 τὸ κάτιστ[χον τῶν ποιη]μάτων) *est rhetorum* χαρακτήρ ἰσχνός, *cf. Demetr. De elocutione 36 et 190-235 9 οὐχὶ μῆκος cf. Callim. Aetia III fr. 57.1 13-14 Mimnermus p. 84 West (= T10A Allen) 14 Philitas T24 Sbardella (= T7b Spanoudakis)**

1 [πολλάκ]ι μοι Τελχῖνες Pontani 1999 pp. 57-59 et Bastianini ad loc. p. 154 4 ἴλει vel ἴδει Norsa-Vitelli¹ : *potius ἴδει quam ἴλει Norsa-Vitelli², vix recte iuxta Pfeiffer et Massimilla : Ἰδίωνι Gallavotti 1932 p. 232 n. 3 : Ἰλιονεῖ (?) Pfeiffer supplementa varia ad vv. 4 sqq. collegit Herter 1937 p. 109 5 Σικελίδη Gallavotti e Theocrito 7.40 5-6 τῷ ὀνο[μα]τοποιῶ vel τῷ ὀνο[μα]τουργῶ Garulli 2005 pp. 89-90 6 hasta litt. π vel η, ut videtur, e.g. Πυρίππω Pfeiffer cf. IG 7.3458.1, 7 ethnicum ut e.g. Λέμ]βω subesse potest (Pfeiffer) 8 τοῖς με]μφομ(έν)οις vel καταμε]μφομ(έν)οις Pfeiffer : με]μφομ(έν)οις Rostagni 1933 : με]μφόμ(εν)ος Aly col. 1783.16-17 9 ἦρα] *potius ρα quam γα Pfeiffer 9-10 ἦρατο Gallavotti : Ἡρακλείδης Coppola 10 post ο fortasse ς; post οι potius ε quam η Pfeiffer 11 post ων litt. λ paene certa; vix α vel δ; ι legi non potest: nomen Apollonii complures hic introducere frustra conati sunt (Pfeiffer) .].ο.].]. Norsa-Vitelli : .].ο.].]. Pfeiffer 12 pro τε fortasse δὲ scribendum censent Norsa-Vitelli, ut in lin. 51 13 ὄν]τ(α) Norsa-Vitelli valde dubitanter : τ' pap. 14 καὶ) Bastianini p. 153 n. 24 et ad loc. p. 154 : καὶ Norsa-Vitelli¹ p. 128 φιλεῖτατ' ου et βελτεῖονα' pap. 15 αὐτ(ῶν) sive αὐτ(ά) · αυτ' pap.**

Goossens 1943 pp. 134-37, Brink 1946 pp. 16-19, Pfeiffer 1949 pp. 351-52 (ad fr. 460), Rostagni 1950 pp. 72-73, Aly 1954 col. 1782.48-1784.32, Capovilla 1967 p. 50, Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 95 et 136, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 111, Fraser 1972, I pp. 747-49 et II pp. 1053-54, Lefkowitz 1981 pp. 118-19 et 124-27, Capasso 1984 pp. 397-98 n. 35, Fairweather 1984 pp. 345-46, Hutchinson 1988 pp. 82 n. 110, Lehnus 1993, Cameron 1995 pp. 185-232 et 376, Bastianini 1996 p. 70, Massimilla 1996 pp. 199-201, Asper 1997 pp. 212 n. 21, Manetti-Montanari 1999, Schenkeveld-Barnes 1999 p. 221, Lehnus 2000 pp. 38-51, Hunter 2002 pp. 88-92, Krevans 2004, Garulli 2005, Lelli 2005 pp. 113-15, Bastianini 2006 pp. 152-166, Sens 2011 pp. lv-lx, 212-19, 234-43.

² The Telchines, archaic divinities associated chiefly with the island of Rhodes, have a two-sided story: in one tradition they are meritorious inventors of the metallurgical crafts, but in another they are spiteful, jealous gnomes. Callimachus uses the latter sense metaphorically when he speaks of Telchines meaning his enemies.

³ This fragment proposes a *Commentary* on the first verses of Callimachus, *Causes* 1, fr. 1 (p. 57.1-7 Massimilla): “*The Telchines*, who were ignorant and no friends of the Muse, *murmured against my song* that I did not sing a single and continuous poem praising either kings, in many tens of thousands of verses, or heroes, but I wind the poem on a little theme, like a child, even if the decade of years is not short. . . . And I (say) this to the Telchines...” Callimachus used the Telchines as a metaphor for his enemies: this later *Commentary* provides an identification of them with poets and intellectuals of his time, among them Praxiphanes. Lefkowitz 1981 and Cameron 1995 pp. 213, 220, 376-77 are sceptical about the idea that Callimachus attacked Praxiphanes for defending Plato or Aristotle against his attacks. Cameron thinks that the *Causes* and its Prologue were inspired by a separate controversy among Callimachus, Asclepiades, and Posidippus.

⁴ Asclepiades of Samos was called ‘Sicelidas’ by his friend Theocritus (*Idyll* 7.40): he was active about 270 BC, and is considered the earliest of the sympotic and erotic epigrammatists of the Hellenistic Age. See the volume of Sens 2011.

⁵ Posidippus of Pella was active in the 3rd cent. BC: his poems concerning drinking and love are quoted by Athenaeus and included in the *Greek Anthology*. The *Milan Papyrus* preserves 112 lines of his poems on other subjects (*PMil.* Vogl. VIII 309, of the late 3rd or early 2nd cent. BC, see Posidippus’ edition of Austin–Bastianini 2002). Both Posidippus and Asclepiades admired the epic poems of Antimachus of Colophon: for Asclepiades, see Sens 2011 pp. lvi, 186, 213-15, for Posidippus see F 140 Austin–Bastianini = Antimachus T 14 Matthews 1996. Callimachus detested these poems, but both he and Posidippus admired Mimnermus, see *Aitia* fr. 1.11-12 and Posidippus, *Palatine Anthology* 12.168 = F 140 Austin–Bastianini. Posidippus seems to have had a particularly close relationship with Asclepiades (Sens 2011 pp. lvii-lx). Austin and Bastianini, commenting on T*4, approve the suggestion of Homolle 1886 p. 69 to recognize the poet under the name of the *architheoros* Posidippus in the Delian Inscription *IG* 11.2 226B5, dated surely to 257 BC (cf. **14** and see Homolle 1886 p. 69, Dürrbach 1912 p. 113, Matelli’s article in this volume).

⁶ Pfeiffer 1949 in his critical note on lin. 6 proposes to read the name *Pyrrippus* (an unknown rhetor).

Callimachi opus *In Praxiphanem*

11 Callimachus ap. *Vitam graecam Arati* 1 (olim sub auctore Achille Tatio, fr. 460 Pfeiffer)

16W μέμνηται γοῦν αὐτοῦ (*scil.* Ἀράτου) καὶ Καλλίμαχος ὡς πρεσβυτέρου οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Πραξιφάνην πάνυ ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ὡς πολυμαθῇ καὶ ἄριστον ποιητήν.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T5a Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De textu vid. Maass p. 78.21-4, Martin p. 9.5-9, Di Maria p. 61.17-19

1-2 *cf. Callim. Epigr. 27 Pfeiffer 2 p. 88 (= AP 9.507)* Ἡσιόδου τό τ' ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν / ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον / τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο· χαίρετε λεπταί / ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον (σύντονον *Runken*) ἀγρυπνίης 2-4 *cf. 7 et Vitam Arati graecam 3 (Martin p. 16 col. b linn. 12-14)* ἐγένετο δὲ σφόδρα πολυγράμματος ἀνὴρ, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Καλλίμαχος

⁷ Praxiphanes is called ‘Mytilenean’ also in **7, 9A, 9B**. Cf. ***16**.

⁸ Mimnermus of Smyrna, said to be from Colophon (whose foundation he described), was an elegiac poet of the 7th cent. BC, author of a quasi-epic poem called *Smyrneis* and of short elegies collected under the title *Nanno*.

⁹ Philitas of Cos was a scholar-poet who flourished in the late 4th to the early 3rd cent. BC. See Sbardella 2000.

Callimachus’ *Reply to Praxiphanes*

11 Callimachus in Achilles Tatius, *Life of Aratus* 1¹

Callimachus also recalls (Aratus) as older not only in the epigrams² but also in the *Reply to Praxiphanes*,³ praising him as a polymath and excellent poet.⁴

¹ See discussions in Susemihl 1891, I p. 145 et n. 740, Rohde 1914 pp. 106-08 n. 3, Gudeman 1921 coll. 628.45-48, Wilamowitz 1924 p. 212, Wilamowitz 1924, II p. 276, Rostagni 1927 pp. 172-73, Rostagni 1928 p. 21, Herter 1931 col. 388.12-39, Rostagni 1933 pp. 189-210: 196-198, Pohlenz 1933 p. 319, Delage 1940 p. 95, Brink 1946 pp. 12-16 et 25-6, Pfeiffer 1949 commentary to fr. 589 p. 408, Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 95 et 135-36, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 111, Fraser 1972, I p. 749 et II p. 1054, Lefkowitz 1981 pp. 120-21, Rossetti-Furiani 1993 p. 672 n. 43, Cameron 1995 pp. 210-13, 374-79, Krevans 2004 p. 174, Haake 2007 p. 249 et n. 10.

² “Hesiod’s the theme and the manner. I doubt that the last but only the most honeysweet of his verses has the poet of Soli copied. Hail, subtle discourses, the earnest vigil of Aratus” (Callim. *Epigr.* 27 Pfeiffer = *Anth. Pal.* 9.507, modified translation by Mair 1955 p. 157 nr. XXIX).

³ The interpretation of the meaning of the preposition *Pros* + *accusative* in the title of Callimachus’ book is doubtful and problematic. It can express just a direction, i.e. *To Praxiphanes* (Rostagni 1927 pp. 172-73) or a hostile sense, *Against Praxiphanes* (Crönert 1906 p. 180, Coppola 1935 pp. 132-38, Brink 1946 pp. 25-26, Pfeiffer 1949 commentary to fr. 589 p. 408, Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 9 and n. 4; 125 and n. 1; 135-36). Rostagni believes that Callimachus’ poetry had Peripatetic elements and that the book was directed by the pupil Callimachus to the master Praxiphanes against Plato’s praise of Antimachus’ *Lyde*. However, Brink thought that as poet and critic Callimachus opposed Aristotle. “His opposition grew out of, and was implied in, his poetry; it seems to have been argued explicitly in the book against Praxiphanes.” Cameron 1995 pp. 213, 376-77 takes an intermediate position, recognizing, besides Callimachus’ polemic, also some traces of his consonance with Peripatetic philosophy. If Praxiphanes has to be recognized as one of the Telchines against whom Callimachus shoots polemic arrows, the title of this work was presumably intended to be *Against Praxiphanes*. But that does not mean that they were enemies for life.

⁴ Callimachus seems to have praised Aratus and condemned Antimachus’ epic poetry. See Pfeiffer 1949, commentary to fr. 589, p. 408.

12 Alia in Praxiphanem

1a Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.2 (*PHerc.* 1027 col. 13.1-5 p. 190 Capasso) = **20c**

ὥσπερ [καὶ] Πρα[ξ]ιφάνη[ς,] ἢ [οὐ] ἀγ[ασ]τέον, ἐ[ὶ] οὕτως
ἢ [..τ]ῶν [ἐ]μ μέσῳ κα[θ]εστῶτων ἀσύνοπτον ἢ [τι
θε]ωροῦντας

1b Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.3 (*PHerc.* 1027 col. 15.1-9 p. 191 Capasso) = **20d**

... μακρὰν ἀπέειχε Πραξιφάνης τοῦ τῶν δεόντων ἢ τι
λελογίσθαι περὶ φιλίας καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἢ ἔχειν
κατάστασιν ἐμ ἢ φίλων τελευταῖς καὶ ὥς ἢ πολλῆς
ἀσυμφωνίας ἢ ἔγμεν ὁ λόγος, ὃν ἐποι-λήσατο περὶ
τούτων ...

1c Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.4 (*PHerc.* 1027 col. 18.3-15 pp. 192-93 Capasso) = **20e**

ὥς ὁ μὴ ἢ το[ι]οῦτος γινόμενος ἢ ἐ[π' ἄλ]λων [σπ]ουδαίων
ἢ [...]ΤΗΙ ἄλλοῖον ἐαυτὸν εἰσάγει οὖν ἐν τῷ ἢ
σ[υ]λγγράμματι Πραξιφάνης· κακὸν μὲν ἐξάγ[ει] τὸν
ἴδιον [βί]ον, μοιχθ[ηρ]ῶς δὲ φίλοις σ[υ]ν[ι]λαγαστραφήσεται
ΟΥ[.] ἢ ...ΛΟΥΝ γνη[σί]ως Τ[.] ἢ Α δὲ [κ]αὶ παντ[.....] ἢ
[.][..]ΕΡ.ΑΥ[.....]

2 *POxy.* 65.4457, fr. 2.6 = **26**, ubi Haslam 1998 p. 63 n. 6 καὶ
Πραξιφάνης vel κατὰ Πραξιφάνους legere vult

3 *Comment. in Iliadem* 2.763 (*POxy.* 8.1086.11-18) = **25** τὴν
δ' ἀ[πό]δειξιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἠθισμένου ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος
πεποίηται πρὸς Πραξιφάνην κτλ.

4 Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria* I (17a) 5 c (p.
14.20-28 Diehl) = **23A**

5 Porphyrius, *In Timaeum*, fragmentum 1, apud Procl. *In
Platonis Timaeum Commentaria* I (17a) 5 c (pp. 1.1-2.11
Sodano) = **23B** Ὁ δέ γε φιλόσοφος Πορφύριος ἀπαντᾷ
πρὸς αὐτὸν (*i. e.* Πραξιφάνη) κατὰ πόδας κτλ.

12 Other Praises and Criticisms of Praxiphanes

1a Carneiscus, Philistas 2.2
(= **20c**)

just as also Praxiphanes, whom one must admire, if in this way . . . observing ...¹

1b Carneiscus, Philistas 2.3,
(= **20d**)

(If these things are constantly observed, Zopyrus, I think it becomes clear that) Praxiphanes was far from arguing something reasonable about friendship and having an appropriate position in the affairs of friends...

1c Carneiscus, Philistas 2.4
(= **20e**)

That he was not this way with regard to other serious matters . . . Praxiphanes introduces himself in fact in a different way in the composition. He leads his own life badly, and he shall live shamefully with friends . . . nobly . . .

2 *POxy.* 65.4457, fr. 2.6 (= **26**), where Haslam p. 63, n. 6 wants to read

and Praxiphanes (*or* according to Praxiphanes)

3 *POxy.* 8.1086 *Commentary on Iliad* 2.763 (= **25**)

Aristarchus gave his demonstration to Praxiphanes on the basis of his (*scil.* Homer's) usage.²

4 see Proclus, *Commentary on Plato*, Timaeus I (17a) 5 c (p. 14.20-28 Diehl) (= **23A**)

5 Porphyry, fragment 1, in Proclus, *Commentary on Plato*, Timaeus I (17a) 5c (p. 1.1-2.11 Sodano) (cf. **23B**)

The philosopher Porphyry, at any rate, replies to him (Praxiphanes) point by point.

¹ The Epicurean Carneiscus complains about Praxiphanes' words about the death of a friend, Philistas, a Rhodian whose life is dated between 310 and 240 BC by Fraser-Matthews 1987 s.v. Φιλίστας, *Rhodos* p. 463.

Praxiphanes inter Rhodios illustres

13 Strabo, *Geographica* 14.2.13 (pp. 62.17-64.29 Radt)

1W ἄνδρες δ' ἐγένοντο μνήμης ἄξιοι πολλοὶ στρατηλάται
 τε καὶ ἀθληταί, ὧν εἰσι καὶ οἱ Παναίτιου τοῦ φιλοσόφου
 πρόγονοι· τῶν δὲ πολιτικῶν καὶ τῶν περὶ λόγους καὶ
 φιλοσοφίαν ὃ τε Παναίτιος αὐτὸς καὶ Στρατοκλῆς καὶ
 Ἀνδρόνικος ὁ ἐκ τῶν Περιπάτων καὶ Λεωνίδης ὁ Στῳϊκός, 5
 ἔτι δὲ πρότερον Πραξιφάνης καὶ Ἱερώνυμος καὶ Εὐδήμος.
 Ποσειδώνιος δ' ἐπολιτεύσατο μὲν ἐν Ῥόδῳ καὶ ἐσο-
 φίστευσεν, ἦν δ' Ἀπαμεὺς ἐκ τῆς Συρίας, καθάπερ καὶ
 Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ μαλακὸς καὶ Μόλων. ἦσαν γὰρ Ἀλαβανδεῖς,
 Μενεκλέους μαθηταὶ τοῦ ῥήτορος (ἐπεδήμησε δὲ πρότερον 10
 Ἀπολλώνιος, ὃς δ' ἦκεν ὁ Μόλων, καὶ ἔφη πρὸς αὐτὸν
 ἐκεῖνος "ὄψὲ μολών"). καὶ Πείσανδρος δ', ὁ τὴν Ἡράκλειαν
 γράψας ποιητής, Ῥόδιος καὶ Σιμμίας ὁ γραμματικὸς
 καὶ Ἀριστοκλῆς ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς· Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ Θρᾷξ καὶ
 Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας ποιήσας Ἀλεξανδρεῖς 15
 μὲν, ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ Ῥόδιοι. περὶ μὲν Ῥόδου ἀποχρώντως
 εἴρηται.

*De Praxiphane vid. etiam Preller p. 5, T3 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De
 textu vid. Meineke p. 914.12-29 et Cobet p. 221*

2-4 Panaetius T4 Alesse 6 Hieronymus fr. 1 Wehrli = 1A White Eudemus fr.
 2 Wehrli 7 Posidonius T2a Theiler 1 p. 7 9 et 11 Apollonius Molo 728 T1a
 FGrHist et LGGA s.v. Apollonius [11] Molo 12 Pisander T4 PEG 1 p. 165
 14 Dionysius Thrax LGGA s.v. Dionysius [14]

4 φιλοσοφίαν *i*: φιλοσοφίας *BCD*: φιλοσοφίαις *F* 5 Στῳϊκός *F*: σοφιστής
D 8 καὶ *om. F* 9 δὲ *pro* γὰρ *Meineke* 11 <ὁ> Ἀπολλώνιος *dubitanter Radt*
in app. 12 ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐλθόν *post* μολών *habent codd. : delevit Radt* 13
 Σιμμίας : Σιμίας *Cobet*

² My new reading of this text (see **25**) recognizes an idealized dialogue between Aristarchus and Praxiphanes (one hundred years older) about the Homeric *deuteron proteron* that Aristarchus was going to recognize as *Homeric usage* and that Praxiphanes had first observed from a poetic point of view. Hunt's reading, "Aristarchus has written the defence of the poet in reply to Praxiphanes," followed by almost all the scholars, recognizes Aristarchus' disagreement with - rather than high consideration for - the Peripatetic.

Praxiphanes among Famous Rhodians

13 Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.13 (p. 62.17-64.29 Radt)¹

There have been many men (of Rhodes) worthy of mention:² both commanders and athletes, including the ancestors of Panaetius the philosopher, and also statesmen, scholars, and philosophers, including Panaetius himself,³ Stratocles,⁴ Andronicus the Peripatetic,⁵ Leonides the Stoic,⁶ and still earlier Praxiphanes,⁷ Hieronymus,⁸ and Eudemus.⁹ Poseidonius was active in the politics of Rhodes and taught there, but he was from Apamea in Syria;¹⁰ likewise Apollonius *Malakos* (i.e. 'the Soft')¹¹ and (Apollonius) the *Molon*,¹² who were from Alabanda and students of Menecles the orator. Apollonius settled in Rhodes first and Molon (i.e. 'comer')¹³ came later, so Apollonius said to him "late Molon". Also Peisander, the poet who wrote the *Heracleia*, was a Rhodian,¹⁴ and Simmias the scholar,¹⁵ and in our time Aristocles.¹⁶ Dionysius Thrax¹⁷ and the Apollonius who wrote the *Argonautica*,¹⁸ though Alexandrians, were called Rhodians. About Rhodes enough has been said.

¹ See discussions in Preller 1842 p. 5, Pfeiffer 1968 p. 266, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 105, Wehrli (Hier.) p. 29, Wehrli 1983 p. 567, Rossetti-Furiani 1993 pp. 637-715, Alesse 1997 pp. 156-57, Mygind 1999 p. 263 nn. 10, 13, 33, Engels 2005 pp. 129-143, Haake 2007 p. 198 n. 17, Radt 2009 pp. 76-79.

² Engels 2005 studies Strabo's attention to men of high reputation. He observes that Strabo gives a predominant position to philosophers. He adopted the pretension not to have written a simple geographical treatise but a philosophical work composed to promote the higher education of the elite in the Augustan empire. Primo 2010 p. 255 remarks that Strabo's description of the men of high reputation in Rhodes seems to derive from his own research rather than from another source.

³ Panaetius was a Stoic philosopher of the 2nd cent. BC (see Alesse 1997 for a recent edition of his fragments and the cap. "Panaitios: Zwischen Lindos, Athen und Rom" in Haake 2007 pp. 198-205. Mygind 1999 pp. 256-57 nr. 10.)

⁴ Stratocles was Panaetius' pupil (1st cent. BC) (see Stratokles nr. 8 in *RE* 2.4 (1931) coll. 271.47-272 and Mygind 1999 p. 258 nr. 13).

⁵ Andronicus of Rhodes was a Peripatetic philosopher of the 1st cent. BC who

PROXENIAE ALIIQUE HONORES (14-17)

Decretum de proxenia Praxiphani,
Dionysiphani filio, Deli tributa

14 IG 11.4 nr. 613 (pp. 20-21 Roussel)

4W Θεοί.
Ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.
Χοιρύλος Θαρσύνοντος εἶπεν.

edited Aristotle's work (see Moraux 1973 pp. 45-94 and 97-141 and Mygind 1999 p. 258 nr. 16).

⁶ Leonides was a Stoic philosopher of uncertain date, see Leonides 3, in *RE* 12 (1924) col. 2035, 5-7; Görler 1994 pp. 706-07 and Mygind 1999 p. 258 nr. 15.

⁷ See Mygind 1999 p. 263 n. 33.

⁸ Hieronymus of Rhodes was a Peripatetic philosopher of the 3rd cent. BC. Edition and discussions in Fortenbaugh-White 2004. See Mygind 1999 p. 255 nrs. 7-8 and Matelli's article in this volume.

⁹ Aristotle's pupil and Theophrastus' colleague, Eudemus (4th cent. BC) moved to Rhodes where he opened a branch of the Peripatetic school; see Gottschalk 1998, Mygind 1999 p. 254 nr. 2, Gottschalk 2002, Wehrli-Wöhrle-Zhmud 2004 p. 558, Matelli 2004 p. 303 and Matelli's article in this volume.

¹⁰ Posidonius (2nd-1st cent. BC), Stoic philosopher, was Panaetius' pupil in Athens. Fragments edited with commentary by Edelstein - Kidd 1972-89. See Mygind 1999 p. 256 nr. 10.

¹¹ Apollonius 'Malakos' was a rhetorician of Alabanda of the 2nd-1st cent. BC, see Apollonios 84, in *RE* 2 (1896) coll. 140.10-41.13 and Mygind 1999 p. 260 nr. 22.

¹² Apollonius 'Molon' was a rhetorician of Alabanda of the 1st cent. BC, who taught rhetoric in Rhodes, see Apollonios 85, in *RE* 2(1896) coll. 141.14-144.9. See Mygind 1999 p. 260 nr. 24.

¹³ *Molōn* is a participle meaning 'having come.'

¹⁴ Peisander was an archaic epic poet of the 7th cent. BC. See *Peisandros* 11, *RE* 19 (1937) coll. 144.35-145.59.

¹⁵ Poet and philologist of the 4th-3rd cent. BC, see Fränkel 1915 and Di Gregorio 2008 who demonstrates that the Rhodian spelling of this name is *Simias* although all the literary sources write *Simmias* (Di Gregorio 2008 p. 52 and n. 7). Mygind 1999 p. 271 nr. 65.

¹⁶ Aristocles was a *rhētor* of the 1st cent. BC. See s.v. Aristokles nr. 18 *RE* II (1896) coll. 935.35-36.6 and Mygind 1999 p. 264 nr. 36.

¹⁷ Dionysius Thrax, grammarian and historian, was born and lived in Alexandria where he had been a student of Aristarchus (2nd cent. BC) and from where he fled to Rhodes. See s.v. Dionysios Thrax nr. 134, *RE* 5 (1905) coll. 977.18-983.50, Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 266-272, Mygind 1999 p. 263-64 nr. 34.

¹⁸ The poet Apollonius of Rhodes (3rd cent. BC), author of the *Argonautica* and of *Epigrams*, composed mythological works on the foundation of Alexandria and Rhodes. Mygind 1999 p. 272 nr. 69.

PROXENIES AND OTHER HONOURS (14-17)

Decree of Proxeny at Delos in Honor of Praxiphanes, Dionysiphanes' Son

14 IG 11.4 nr. 613¹

Gods. It is decreed by the council and the people. Choirylus son of Tharsynon² spoke. Whereas Praxiphanes, son of Dionysiphanes, is of regular service³ to the city of the Delians and does whatever

- ἐπειδὴ Πραξιφάνης (*vacat*)
 5 Διονυσιφάνους χρήσιμος ὢν
 διατελεῖ τῇ πόλει τῇ Δηλίων
 καὶ ποεῖ ὅ τι δύναται ἀγαθὸν
 Δηλίους καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ,
 δεδόχθαι τῷ δήμῳ εἶναι
 10 Πραξιφάνη Διονυσιφάνους
 εὐεργέτην τε τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἐν
 Δήλῳ καὶ πρόξενον Δηλίων καὶ
 αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνους αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶνα[ι]
 αὐτοῖς ἀτέλειαν πάντων καὶ γῆ[ς]
 15 καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησιν καὶ πολι-
 τείαν καὶ προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς
 [ἀ]γῶσι· ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν
 [καὶ] τὴν βουλὴν τὴν ἀεὶ βουλευ-
 [ουσαν], εἴαν τινος δέωνται, χρη-
 20 [ματίζο]υσαν πρώτοις μετὰ τὰ
 [ἱερά· ὅπως δ]ὲ εἰ κύρια τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ
 [δήμου ἐψηφισ]μένα, ἀναγράψαι
 [τόδε τὸ ψήφισμ]α τὴν μὲν βουλὴν
 [εἰς τὸ βουλευτήρι]ον, τοὺς δὲ
 25 [ἱεροποιού]ς εἰς τὸ [ἱε]ρόν.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam T1 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De inscriptione vid. Dürrbach 1904 pp. 133-138 n. 33, Wilhelm 1905 pp. 1-5, Guarducci 1929 nr. XIX p. 657, Haake 2007 pp. 247-48

2 τῇ βουλεῖ *inscriptio, Dürrbach, Wilhelm* : τῇ βουλῇ *Roussel, Brink, Wehrli* 9 τῷ δήμῳ· *Roussel* 10 Πραξιφάνη *ita inscriptio et Roussel* : Πραξιφάνην *Dürrbach et Wilhelm* Διονυσιφάνους : *cf. 9A* Πραξιφάνης Διονυσοφάνους Μιτυληναῖος *et *15* Διονουσοφάεις Πραξιφάνεος 14 γῆ[ς] *Roussel et Wehrli* : γῆς *Dürrbach, Wilhelm, Brink* 19 *virgulas addidi* 21 [ἱερά· ὅπως δ]ὲ *Roussel* : [ἱερά, ὅπως ἀν] *Dürrbach (quem secutus est Wilhelm), adnotans p. 138: “Pour la restitution de la l. 21, je m'autorise d'une formule analogue que présente un autre décret de proxénie inédit, et découvert aussi par M. Hauvette” virgulas addidi* 23 [τόδε τὸ ψήφισμ]α *Roussel* : [δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμ]α *Dürrbach, spatium esse XI/XII litterarum comprobant Daniela Summa (IG Berolini), quae, meo rogatu, lapidis impressionem inspexit*

good is possible for the Delians, both in word and deed, it has been decreed by the people that Praxiphanes son of Dionysiphanes be (recognized as) a benefactor of the sanctuary in Delos and *proxenos*⁴ of the Delians, both himself and his descendants, and that they have freedom from all taxation and the right to own land and household and privileged seating at the contests. The care for these belongs to the council which is ever in session: if they have need of something, the council is to provide for them first after the needs of the temple. In order that what has been voted by the people have authority, the council is to inscribe it in the council chamber and the priest in the sanctuary.

¹ See discussions in Crönert 1906 p. 74 n. 355^a, pp. 179-80, Christ-Schmid 1920 p. 80 n. 1, Beloch 1925 pp. 597-98 n. 4, Wilamowitz 1924, II p. 276 n. 1, Aly 1954 coll. 1770.3-33, 1779, 5-15, Tarn 1969 p. 469, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 106, Wehrli 1983 p. 567, Capasso 1984 pp. 394-407, Marek 1984 p. 266, Vial 1984 pp. 101, 134, Salvadori Baldascino 1990 pp. 65-6, *SEG* 40 (1990) n. 671 p. 208, Tréheux 1992 p. 73, Labarre 1996 p. 60, Scholz 1998 pp. 190 (et n. 19), 367, Mygind 1999 p. 263 n. 33, Dorandi 1999 p. 36 et n. 29, Haake 2007 pp. 247-51, Dorandi in this volume.

² On Choirylus son of Tharsynon, see Fraser 1987 p. 486 s.v. Χοιρύλος (9), Marek 1984 p. 266, Capasso 1984 p. 395.

³ The adjective *chrēsimos* ('in service') and the verb *diatelei* ('continue being') signifies that at the time of this inscription Praxiphanes was still considered 'useful' to the Delians (Scholz 1998 p. 190 n. 18) and that he gained honours probably through some lasting diplomatic activity, which the Delians considered favourable.

⁴ In the Hellenistic period the *proxenos* was the citizen of a *polis* who performed diplomatic relations on behalf of another state, which – in return for services already rendered and expected in the future – bestowed upon him honors, privileges, and sometimes even citizenship (see Marek 1984, Gauthier 1985). Philosophers and learned fellows successfully performed these political activities; see Scholz 1998, Haake 2007.

72 **Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea**

* Dionousophaeis, Praxiphanis filius,
in virorum catalogo (Thespiis in Boeotia)

***15** *IG 7.1752.6-7* (pp. 306-307 Dittenberg)

omissis ΔΙΟΝΟΥ-
σοφάεις Πραξιφάνεος *omissis*

De inscriptione vid. etiam Foucart 1885 n. 27 pp. 419-21 De nomine cf. 9A, 14, Bechtel 1917 p. 138, s.v. Διονουσοφάεις Πραξιφάνεος, Fraser-Matthews 2000 pp. 119 et 361. Urbs Thespie ad montem Heliconem sita est (Paus. Graeciae Descriptio 9.26.6 : Θέσπια ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος τὸν Ἑλικῶνα ᾤκισται, vid. app. 28A)

* Decretum de proxenia Praxiphani Damosthenis
(fortasse Praxiphanis cognati) Eresi tributa

***16** *IG 12 Suppl. 127.13-17* (pp. 60-65 Hodot)

Pars A

[Μυ]τι[λή]ναιοι· Ἀπόλλωνι. [?]

[Φ]αινίας Ποσειδείου

15 [Κ]ύλησις Μνασιλάειος

Πραξιφάνης Δαμοσθένει[ος]

Δίης Δ[αμο]σθέν[ει]ο[ς]

De inscriptione vid. Hiller von Gaertringen pp. 39-40, SEG 26 (1976-77) nr. 919 A (a) pp. 216-17

15-16 *Fraser - Matthews 1987 p. 117 s.v. Δαμοσθένης 9 et p. 385 s.v. Πραξιφάνης*

13 *suppl. Hiller von Gaertringen* [?] *Hodot* 15 [Κ]ύλησις *Hodot 1976* : [Κ]λήσις *Hiller von Gaertringen* 17 Δίης *pro* Διεύς *Hiller von Gaertringen*
Pars A cum linea 17 finem habet

* Dionousophaeis, Son of Praxiphanes, in a Military
Catalogue of *Epheboi* in Thespies

*15 IG 7.752.6-7¹

Dionou-
sophaeis, son of Praxiphanes.²

¹ See discussion in Hennig 1985 p. 336.

² The date (3rd cent. BC, see Fraser-Matthews 2000 pp. 119 and 361), the town (Thespiae, see **28 A-B**), and the reverse correspondence between the same name and the patronymic found in **1C** and **1D** allow us to suppose that the young man mentioned in this military catalogue may have been the son of our Praxiphanes. That suggests that Praxiphanes obtained citizenship in Thespiae. See Matelli 2009, where I suppose that – in this case – Praxiphanes obtained honors thanks to his research on Hesiod, the local ancient poet, whose increasing fame threw light upon his homeland, where a memorial of him was built. Callimachus chose Hesiod as his poetic inspirer (*Aitia* fr. 4 Massimilla).

* Decree of Proxeny at Eresus in Honor of Mytilenean
Praxiphanes Son of Damosthenes

*16 IG 12 Suppl. 127.13-17¹

Side A
Mytileneans: To Apollo.
Phaenias, son of Posidonius
Cylēsis, son of Mnasilas
Praxiphanes, son of Damosthenes²
Diēs, son of Damosthenes

¹ See discussions in Robert 1966 pp. 115-21, *SEG* 40 (1990) nr. 671 p. 208, Salvadori Baldascino 1990 pp. 65-66, Haake 2007 p. 249 n. 13.

² Salvadori Baldascino 1990 pp. 65-66 thinks that this man may have been a relative of Praxiphanes, Dionysiphanes' son, quoted in *IG* 11.4 nr. 613 (**14**). Haake 2007 p. 249 n. 13 does not find support for the statement of this inscription. But because of the rarity of the name Praxiphanes and the same homeland Mytilene as our philosopher, Salvadori Baldascino may be right so that we might suspect at least a remote familiar relationship between the two.

74 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

* Nomen sacerdotis
Solis Rhodiensium in bullis ceramicis
Alexandriae inventis

***17A** Bulla ceramica Alexandriae nr. 157a (p. 242 Neroutsos)

ἐπὶ Πραξιφάνευσ

Hanc bullam Praxiphani vindicat Aly 1954 col. 1772.58-62

***17B** Bulla ceramica Alexandriae nr. 157b (p. 242 Neroutsos)

ἐπὶ Πραξιφάνευσ. Ἀγριανίου

Hanc bullam Praxiphani vindicat Aly 1954 col. 1772.58-62

* The Name Praxiphanes, Eponymous Archon
of Rhodes, on two Amphora Stamps
of the Ptolemaic Age, Found at Alexandria.¹

*17A nr. 157a p. 242 Neroutsos²

In the year of Praxiphanes' archonship.

¹ The name of an eponymous archon 'Praxiphanes' seems to be printed on two rectangular stamps of handles of Rhodian wine- or oil- amphorae found in a storeroom of Alexandria. The name of the eponymous archon indicates the Rhodian year. Months gradually started to be written on handle-stamps around 240 BC.

² About these two amphorae stamps, see Nilsson 1909 p. 80, Hiller von Gaertringen 1931 col. 839.61-2, Aly 1954 col. 1772.58-62. On the trade in Rhodian wine- or oil- amphorae in Alexandria, see Lund 1999 p. 198 and n. 25 at p. 204.

Hiller von Gaertringen 1931 col. 839.61-2 nr. 253 listed the name of the Rhodian eponymous archon Praxiphanes after Neroutsos' edition of amphora stamps, based on Johannes Demetrios' collection, in addition to the more common name Pratophanes; Aly 1954 col. 1772.58-62 recognized our Praxiphanes under this name. Despite criticisms of some other Neroutsos readings (pp. 109-120), Nilsson 1909 accepted and listed the name Praxiphanes at p. 80. But he made a mistake in the bibliographical reference of Neroutsos' work and, since then (besides Lund 1999 p. 198 and n. 25 p. 204, who wrote about private collections of stamps), this collection is no longer quoted, or quoted with Nilsson's mistake (Finkielsztejn 2001 p. 18). Unless contrary evidence appears, I doubt that 'Praxiphanes' (a *lectio difficilior*!) can be considered simply a Neroutsos' misreading of the much more common name Pratophanes. Admittedly, we do not have any other explicit evidence of Praxiphanes as Rhodian archon. Nevertheless see 14.

*17B nr. 157b p. 242 Neroutsos

In the year of Praxiphanes' archonship. In the month of Agrianus.¹

¹ Observe the indication of the month-name *Agrianios* on one of the two stamps named after the year of the eponym Praxiphanes. *Agrianios* corresponds to our month November according to Neroutsos 1874 p. 223 or to an unidentified spring month according to Nilsson 1909 p. 135, who observes "La place du mois est donc variable et ne permet pas de conclusion pour Rhodes." The months started to be indicated on handle-stamps around 240 BC according to Grace 1974 pp. 194-200 (see also Finkielsztejn 2001 p. 165) or around 246 BC (Period IIa) after Conovici-Irimia 1991 p. 162 followed by Finkielsztejn 2001 p. 181-82. Around this date the indication of the months was still irregular; I wonder if we can date these two stamps that name Praxiphanes around this time.

II. OPERA

18 Tabula operum

1 Περὶ ἱστορίας]

Marcellinus, *Vita Thucydidis* 29 = **21** (ὥς φησι Πραξιφάνης ἐν τῷ περὶ ἱστορίας).

2 Περὶ ποιημάτων]

Philodemus, *De poematibus* 5.2 (*PHerc.* 1425 col. 12.10-35 et *PHerc.* 1538 coll. 9.10-10.1) = **27** (ἐν [τ]ῷ πρώτῳ περὶ ποιη[μά]των).

3 Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἰσοκράτους διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν]

Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 3.8 = **22** (Πραξιφάνης ἀνέγραψε διατριβὴν τινα περὶ ποιητῶν γενομένην ἐν ἀγρῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι ἐπιξενωθέντος τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους).

4 σύγγραμμα (περὶ φιλίας)]

Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.4 (*PHerc.* 1027 col. 18.7-9) = **20e** (ἐν τῷ σ[υ]γγράμματι Πραξιφάνης).

5 *De elementis sermonis* (Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων)]
***32** cf. **24, 29A-*29C, 30A¹-*30B, 33a-c**

6 *De raris locutionibus*] **30A¹-*30B, 31**

7 *In Homeri Odysseam*] **25**

8 *In Hesiodi Opera et Dies*] **28A-B**

9 *In Sophoclis Oedipum Colonaeum*] **29A-*29C**

10 *In Platonis Timaeum*] **23A-B**

11 *De mundo*] **19**

II. WRITINGS

18 List of Titles and Subjects¹

1 *On History*] Marcellinus, *Life of Thucydides* 29 = **21**

as Praxiphanes says in his book *On History*.²

2 *On Poems*] Philodemus, *On Poems* 5.10-35 (*PHerc.* 1425 and 1538 col. 9.10-10.1) = **27**

in his first book *On Poems*.³

3 *Plato's and Isocrates' Discussion on Poets*] ⁴ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 3.8 = **22**

And Praxiphanes wrote a discussion about poets⁵ taking place at Plato's country place with Isocrates as guest.

4 *Composition (on Friendship)*] Carneiscus, Philistas, 2.4 (*PHerc.* 1027, coll. 18.8-9 pp. 187-95 Capasso) = **20e**

In his composition, Praxiphanes introduces himself as different.

5 *On the Elements of Speech*] Porphyry in Simplicius, *On Aristotle's Categories*, Preface = ***32**; see Demetrius, *On Style* 55-58 = **24** and *PHamb.* 128 = ***33a-c**

6 On Rare words] **30A-B, 31**

7 Commentary on Homer's *Odyssey*] **25**

8 Commentary on Hesiod's *Works and Days*] **28A-B**

9 Commentary on Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*] **29A**

10 Commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*] **23A-B**

11 On the World] Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35-39 **19**

¹ Indirect sources present only few certain titles of Praxiphanes' works. Therefore I prefer to indicate here either the certain titles (denoted by italic letters) or the subjects, for the cases where we do not get more precise indications from the source.

² Scholars wonder in which sense the term 'history' has to be interpreted; see notes to **21**.

*DE MUNDO

19 Epiphanius, *De fide* 9.35-39 (p. 508.4-15 Holl-Dummer)

- 35 Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ Νικομάχου, κατὰ μέν τινας Μακεδῶν
 ἀπὸ Σταγείρων, ὡς δὲ ἔνιοι Θράξ ἦν τὸ γένος. ἔλεγε δὲ
 δύο ἀρχὰς εἶναι, θεὸν καὶ ὕλην, καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑπεράνω τῆς
 σελήνης θείας προνοίας τυγχάνειν, τὰ δὲ κάτωθεν τῆς
 σελήνης ἀπρονόητα ὑπάρχειν καὶ φορᾶ τινι ἀλόγῳ φέρεσθαι 5
 ὡς ἔτυχεν. εἶναι δὲ λέγει δύο κόσμους, τὸν ἄνω καὶ τὸν
 κάτω, καὶ τὸν μὲν ἄνω ἄφθαρτον, τὸν δὲ κάτω φθαρτόν.
 καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐντελέχειαν σώματος λέγει. Θεόφραστος
 36 Ἐρέσιος τὰ αὐτὰ Ἀριστοτέλει ἐδόξασε. Στράτων [ὦν]
 ἐκ Λαμψάκου τὴν θερμὴν οὐσίαν ἔλεγεν αἰτίαν πάντων 10
 ὑπάρχειν. ἄπειρα δὲ ἔλεγεν εἶναι τὰ μέρη τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ
 2w 38 πᾶν ζῶον ἔλεγε νοῦ δεκτικὸν εἶναι. Πραξιφάνης Ῥόδιος
 39 τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Θεοφράστῳ ἐδόξασε. Κριτόλαος ὁ Φασηλίτης
 τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει ἐδόξασε.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam Preller pp. 5, 7-8, T2b et T7 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De textu vid. Diels p. 592.9-20

8 ἐντελέχειαν *vel* ἐνδελέχειαν *Arist. De anima 2.1 (412a9-10)* ἔστι δ' ἡ
 μὲν ὕλη δύναμις, τὸ δ' εἶδος ἐντελέχεια, (412a 19-22) ἀναγκαῖον ἄρα τὴν
 ψυχὴν οὐσίαν εἶναι ὡς εἶδος σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζῶν ἔχοντος.
 ἡ δ' οὐσία ἐντελέχεια· τοιούτου ἄρα σώματος ἐντελέχεια, (412a27-b9)
 διὸ ἡ ψυχὴ ἐστὶν ἐντελέχεια ἡ πρώτη σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζῶν
 ἔχοντος. τοιοῦτον δὲ ὃ ἂν ἦ ὀργανικόν. ... εἰ δὴ τι κοινὸν ἐπὶ πάσης
 ψυχῆς δεῖ λέγειν, εἴη ἂν ἐντελέχεια ἡ πρώτη σώματος φυσικοῦ ὀργανικοῦ.
 διὸ καὶ οὐ δεῖ ζητεῖν εἰ ἐν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὸν κηρὸν
 καὶ τὸ σχῆμα, οὐδ' ὅλως τὴν ἐκάστου ὕλην καὶ τὸ οὐ ἡ ὕλη· τὸ γὰρ ἐν
 καὶ τὸ εἶναι ἐπεὶ πλεοναχῶς λέγεται, τὸ κυρίως ἡ ἐντελέχειά ἐστιν;
Stob. Anthol. 1.49.1a (Wachsmuth 1 p. 319.6-8 = Arist. T19 Gigon p. 135 col. B linn. 33-36) Ἀριστοτέλης ἐνδελέχειαν (*sed* ἐντελέχειαν *scribendum*

³ Brink 1946 p. 23 n. 2 and Dahlmann 1953 p. 7 n. 2 have remarked that Praxiphanes seems to be the first author of a work entitled *On Poems*.

⁴ *Diatribè* indicates a dialogue on poets that probably does not have to be identified with the treatise *On Poems* (27), even if Heraclides Ponticus wrote one book *On Poetics and the Poets* (fr. 17.38 Schütrumpf). See Brink 1946 p. 23 n. 2, who interprets *On Poets* as the title of an acroamatic work. Susemihl 1891, I p. 145-46 and n. 741, Podlecki 1969 p. 124, Rostagni 1926 p. 288 n. 1 and Janko 1991 p. 58 and 2000 p. 153 suspect that Praxiphanes' dialogue *On Poets* is the same work as *On Poems* (27). See Vallozza in this volume.

⁵ Diogenes Laertius' words are dealing with a Praxiphanes' dialogue about poets: even if we suppose the plausible title *On Poets*, we do not have direct evidence of it.

*COSMOLOGY¹

19 Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35-39²

Aristotle, son of Nicomachus, was a Macedonian from Stagira according to some, but a Thracian in race according to others. He said that there are two principles, god and matter, and that the things above the moon are objects of divine providence, but the things below the moon exist without providence and are borne along in some irrational motion as chance has it. He says that there are two world-orders, that above and that below, and that that (which is) above is imperishable, but that (which is) below is subject to passing away. And he says that the soul is the complete reality of the body.³ Theophrastus of Eresus held the same opinions as Aristotle. Strato of Lampsacus said that the hot substance was the cause of all things. He said that the parts of the world are infinite and that every living creature is capable of possessing intellect. Praxiphanes of Rhodes held the same opinions as Theophrastus. Critolaus of Phaselis held the same opinions as Aristotle.⁴

¹ The asterisk expresses my doubt about the precise subject of Praxiphanes' work in continuity with Theophrastus' speculation on the lunar and sublunar world and on soul as *entelecheia* of the body.

² See discussions in Preller 1842 pp. 7-8, Zeller 1921 (II.2) p. 899 n. 4 p. 907 et n. 5 p. 914 n. 2, p. 920 n. 1, Brink 1946 p. 23, Wehrli (Critol.) commentary on fr. 15 p. 66, Huby 1999 p. 20, Gottschalk 2001 col. 279, Sharples 2006 pp. 320-22 and Sharples in this volume.

³ I follow Wehrli (Critol.) fr. 15 p. 72 who corrected the manuscript reading ἐνδελέχεια ('continuous activity') into ἐντελέχεια (full reality). In the first case

*est, cf. [Plut.] Placita Philosophorum 4.2 898C p. 115.17-19 Mau = Arist. T19 Gigon p. 135 col. A linn. 33-36) πρώτην σώματος φυσικοῦ, ὀργανικοῦ, δυνάμει ζωὴν ἔχοντος· τὴν δ' ἐντελέχειαν ἀκουστέον ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶδους καὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας; Stob. Anthol. 1.49.32 (Wachsmuth 1 pp. 366.25-367.2 = Theophr. 269 FHS&G): Τινὲς μὲν τῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν αἰθέριον σῶμα τὴν ψυχὴν τίθενται· ἕτεροι δὲ τελειότητα αὐτὴν ἀφορίζονται κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ θείου σώματος, ἣν ἐντελέχειαν (ἐνδελέχειαν *FP*, ἐντελέχειαν *Heeren*) καλεῖ Ἀριστοτέλης, ὥσπερ δὴ ἐν ἐνίοις Θεόφραστος (*vide Huby 1999 p. 20 et n. 34*); Cic. Tuscul. 1.10.22 (= Arist. De Philosophia fr. 27 Ross p. 95): “*Quintum genus adhibet (scil. Aristoteles) vacans nomine et sic ipsum animum ἐνδελέχειαν appellat novo nomine quasi quandam continuatam motionem et perennem*” 8-9 Theophrastus 162 FHS&G 9-11 Strato fr. 48 Wehrli = 47 Sharples 13-14 Critolaus fr. 15 Wehrli*

8 ἐντελέχειαν *scripsi ex Critolao, fr. 15 Wehrli p. 72, cf. Stob. Anthol. I 49.1a (Wachsmuth 1 p. 319.6-8 = Arist. T19 Gigon p. 135 col. B, linn. 33-36) : ἐνδελέχειαν J* 9 Στράτων [ὦν] *Diels 1879 p. 592.16 cum adnot. : Στρατωνίων J* 12 ἔλεγε νοῦ *Zeller 1921, II 2 p. 920 n. 1 : ἔλεγε οὐ J*

ETHICA

De amicitia (Σύγγραμμα περὶ φιλίας)

20a Carneiscus, *Philistas* fr. 95 (*PHerc.* 1027 p. 292 Capasso)

fr. 95.2] .INE[- - -]
7 (fr. VIII) W [- - -] ὁ Πραξιφ[άνης- - -]
[- - -] CE..NEN[- - -]
5 [- - -] τελευτη.[- - -]
[- - -] TΩ[- - -]
[- - -].OΨKΑ[- - -]
[- - -] POC

De Praxiphane vid. fr. 11a Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De hoc fragmento vid. fr. VIII Crönert 1906 p. 69

4 σε· ταισιν Wehrli, *Praxiph. fr. 7 (fr. VIII p. 94.5-6)*

the passage would say that the soul is “the continuous activity of the body,” while in the second case, which I follow, the meaning is the opposite: the soul represents “the full reality of the body” (I mean *actuality* as opposed to *activity*). LSJ s.v. ἐντελέχεια specifies “confused with ἐνδελέχεια (q.v.) by Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10.22; Luc. *Jud. Voc.* 10.” I would add also Stob. *Anthol.* 1.49.1a (Wachsmuth 1 p. 319.6-8 = Arist. T19 Gigon p. 135 col. B lines 33-36) where we read ἐνδελέχειαν but we should correct ἐντελέχειαν, cf. [Plut.] *Placita Philosophorum* 4.2 898C p. 115.17-19 Mau = Arist. T19 Gigon p. 135 col. A lines 33-36; also Stob. *Anthol.* 1.49.32 (Wachsmuth 1 pp. 366.25-367.2), where Wachsmuth corrected ἐνδελέχειαν (codd. FP) into ἐντελέχειαν (but the editors of Theophr. 269 FHS&G, quoting Stobaeus’ passage, do not accept this correction). Parallel passages that support the correction into ἐντελέχειαν, (‘realization’): Arist. *De anima* 412a9-10 “Matter is potentiality, while form is realisation.” 412a 19-22 “So the soul must be substance (*ousia*) in the sense of being the form of a natural body, which potentially has life. And substance in this way is realization. Realization of the described kind of body.” 412a27-b9 “The soul may therefore be defined as the main realization of a natural body potentially possessing life, and such will be all what has an organism. ... If then we have to apply a same definition to every soul, it will be ‘the main realization of a natural body possessed of organs.’ So one need no more to ask whether body and soul are one than whether the wax and the impression it receives are one, or in general whether the matter of each thing is the same as that of which is the matter. For admitting that the terms ‘unity’ and ‘being’ are used in many senses, the principal one is that of ‘realisation.’”

⁴ The succession of the Peripatetic scholars, Theophrastus of Eresus, Strato of Lampsacus, Praxiphanes of Rhodes, Critolaus of Phaselis is the same as in *PDuke* inv. G 178, see **3A**. Sharples’ paper in this volume is more sceptical than I am about the philosophical horizon of Praxiphanes’ researches that this source seems to testify.

ETHICS

*A Work On Friendship*¹

20a Carneiscus, *Philistas*²

... Praxiphanes ... death³

¹ Friendship was considered a matter of the utmost importance by Epicurus. Other important discussions on friendship occur in Plat. *Lysis*, Arist. *Nicomachean Ethics* 8 and 9, *Eudemian Ethics* 7, *Magna Moralia* 2.15-17, Theophrastus, *De amicitia* (three books) 532-46 FHS&G, and Clearchus fr. 17-18 Wehrli (two books).

² See discussions on **20a-20e** in Preller 1842 pp. 7-8, Heylbut 1876 p. 9, Usener 1887 p. 93, Crönert 1906 pp. 69-71 and 179-80, Zeller 1921 (II.2) p. 899 n. 4, p. 907 and n. 5 p. 914 n. 2, p. 920 n. 1, Brink 1946 p. 23, Wehrli (Critol.) commenting Critolaus’ fr. 15 p. 66, Usener 1977 pp. 365 and 423, Capasso 1988 *ad loc.*, Konstan 1997 pp. 109-110; Gigante 1999 pp. 23 and 57-60, Huby 1999 p. 20, Gottschalk 2001 col. 279, Warren 2004 p. 134 n. 50, Sharples 2006 pp. 320-22, Dorandi in this volume.

³ The essay entitled *Philistas* is a work on friendship, where Carneiscus

De morte amicorum eorumque desiderio

20b Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.1 (*PHerc.* 1027 coll. 2, 5, 6, 10 pp. 187-89 Capasso)

col. 2.1 KA[.....].Ξ[...]. ἰκα-
νῶς [ή]λ[ατ]τῶσθαι φί-
λου τελευ[τ]ήσαντος
δι[ὰ τ]ὸ μὴ δύνασθαι πα-
ραπ[λ]ησί[ω]ς ἐν τοῖς κα-
5 τ' ἀν[άγκ]ην ἐνεργεῖν
καὶ μόλ[ι]ς τισὶν θεωρή-
μ[α]σι βοηθεῖν.τῇ μὲν.[...]

col. 5.6 ..ΣΙΑΝ κ[α]ὶ κατὰ λό[γο]ν
τῆς εἰς ταῦτὰ συνεργεί-
α[ς], εἰ ΑΙ[...].Ε[....]Ω
ΛΕΜΜΗ[...].Τ..τέλο[ς]
ἐλάτ[τω]σιν ἔφη περὶ
col. 6.1 α[ὐ]τὸν [γε]γονέν[αι τ]ε-
λευτήσαντος τοῦ φί[λου]
πρὸς τ[ὰ]ς ἄλλας ἄς ΔΗ[...]

col. 10.1 KEIN[...].Ο[...].Θ..Α.[π]α-
χύν τινα καὶ ἔ]νεσ-
τιν ἀπολαβε[ῖν] τὴν
διὰ τοῦ πίνειν ἱκανω-
τέραν ἡδον[ή]ν καὶ ταῦ-
5 τ' οὐ καθ' ὅλην [τ]ὴν φύ-
σιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τρόπο[ν]

De papyro vid. Crönert 1906 pp. 69-71 et 179-80 coll. I-XVI et (XVII), Usener 1887 p. 93, Usener 1977 pp. 365 et 423, Gaiser apud Capasso

col. 2.8 τῇ μὲν.[...] : τῇ μέντ[ου] *Crönert p. 70 (col. III.8)* col. 5.7 εἰς

deals with the death of his friend Philistas, presented as a model Epicurean. He writes in open polemic against Praxiphanes' words expressing complaints and sorrow at the death of Philistas, a common friend of theirs. About their different interpretations of friendship and death, see Capasso 1988 pp. 56-82, Konstan 1997 pp. 109-110, and Warren 2004 p. 134 n. 50. The Epicurean Carneiscus and Philistas probably met the Peripatetic Praxiphanes in Rhodes (Capasso 1988 pp. 35-36).

The Death of Friends, and Longing for Them

20b Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.1

. . . to grieve excessively at the death of a friend because of being unable to be strong to the same extent in necessary circumstances and to help scarcely with some conceptions. . . .

and by account of the cooperation toward the same goals . . .

. . . he said the end (death) was a loss for himself when his friend died in other respects, which . . .

. . . It is possible for a fool to take more than enough pleasure through drinking and (to bear) these things not according to the entire nature, but to custom.

84 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

ταῦτα Capasso : εἰς ταῦτα Crönert p. 70 (col. IV.5) 9 τέλο[ς] suppl. Capasso col. 10.1-2 suppl. Capasso 3 ἀπολαβεῖν Crönert p. 70 col. VII.3, vid. Usener 1977 s.vv. ἀπολαβεῖν p. 97, ἡδονή p. 319, ἱκανός, ἱκανῶς p. 339

In Praxiphanis quandam sententiam

20c Carneiscus, Philistas 2.2 (PHerc. 1027 coll. 13-14 pp. 190-91 Capasso)

col. 13.1 ὥσπερ [καὶ] Πρα[ξ]ιφάνη[ς,]
7 (col. VIII) W [οὐ ἀγ]ασ[τ]έον, εἰ[ς] οὕτως
[..τ]ῶν [ἐ]μ μέσῳ κα-
[θεστῶ]των ἀσύνοπτόν
5 [τι, θε]ωροῦντας ὅτι οὐ
[....].ΥΝ ἄνθρωπος
[....].ΦΕ.Ο πρὸς τὰς ΠΑΝ
[.... ἦτ]τον ἐχόμενος
[τῶν πα]θῶν καὶ τῶν λοι-
10 [πῶν διαθέσεων, ὥσ]περ αἰ
[- - -].NEIN
[- - -]ΩΙΦ.
col. 14.2 Ω . καὶ ὑπὸ το[ύτ]ου μ[οι]
7 (col. IX) W δοκεῖ πλανᾶσθα[ι] πλέ[ον]
δὲ τοῦ μὴ πά[ντοτ]ε θεω-
5 ρεῖσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐμπ[ρ]ο-
[εκ]κειμένων γινομένας
ψευδεῖς ὑπολήψεις κα-
θ' ὃν ἐξέθηκα [τ]ρόπον· ἐν-
τεῦθεν γὰρ ἐ[π]ε[ίγ]ει πρὸς
10 τὸ νομίζειν [....] ὅλως
γίνεσθαι διὰ ψεύ[δ]η ἐν
[το]ῖ[ς] τοιούτοις, ἃ μάλ-
[λο]ν μὲν δύσκολ[όν] ἐστι
[....]ΤΑ διειλημ[μ]α[ι]
15 [.....]ΥΤΟ[- - -]

quattuor fere lineae ceciderunt

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. 11b Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De papyro vid. app. 20b

col. 13.3 [ἐρᾶ τῶν ἐ]μ Crönert p. 179 (Nachtr. ad col. VIII) 7 [ἀνεστρ]έφε[τ]ο Crönert p. 70 col. VIII.7 ΠΑΝ vel ΓΑΝ P : ΠΑΝ apogr. Neapolitanum

Against Praxiphanes' View

20c Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.2

... just as also Praxiphanes, whom one must admire, if in this way something set in the middle is not easy to perceive, observing that not . . . less affected by the emotions and the remaining conditions, just as the. . . .

And to me he seems to have been led astray by that and even more by not always observing concerning the aforementioned matters that false assumptions had come about in the way I had set out. For from here he goes on to think ... to come about in general because of lies in such circumstances, which is more difficult ...

et Crönert p. 70 col. VIII : ΠΑΝ apogr. Oxoniense col. 14: extrema pars linearum 2-5, in apogr. Oxon. tantum servatur 4 π[ά]ν[το]τ[ε] *Capasso : πα[ρ]έρ[ω]ς Crönert p. 179 (Nachtr. ad col. IX.4) 5* -ρεῖσθαι περὶ *Capasso : -ρεῖσθαι <τὰς> περὶ Crönert p. 70 n. 342 5-6* ἐμπ[ρ]ο[κ]κ[ε]ιμένων *Capasso : ἐμπροκκειμένων Crönert p. 70 col. IX.6 9* ἐπ[ε]ί[γ]ει *Capasso : ἐνπ[ε]ί[π]τει Crönert p. 70 col. IX.9 10* [...] *non plures quam quattuor litteras cecidisse statuit Capasso, qui in adnotatione critica* [κακὰ] *vel* [τοῦτο] *prop. : οὐδέν Crönert p. 70 col. IX.10 12* [τοῖ]ς τοιούτοις *Capasso : γε* [τοῖς] τοιούτοις *Crönert p. 70 col. IX.13 13* δύσκολ[όν] ἐστι *Capasso : δυσκόλ[ου] ἐστί Crönert p. 70 col. IX.13 14* εἰς δὲ τὰ διειλημμένα *Crönert p. 70 col. IX.14*

Praxiphanes magnopere errat

20d Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.3 (*PHerc.* 1027 coll. 15-18.3 pp. 191-92 Capasso)

col. 15
7 (col. X) W

- [τοῦ-
1 τῶν δὲ τε[τ]η[ρ]ημένων,
Ζώπυρε, νομίζω φανε-
ρὸν γεγ[ο]νέναι, διότι μα-
κρὰν ἀπείχε Πραξιφά-
5 νης τοῦ τῶν δεόντων
τι λελογίσθαι περὶ φιλί-
ας καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν
ἔχειν κατάστασιν ἐμ
φίλων τελευταῖς καὶ ὥς
10 πολλῆς ἀσυμφωνίας
ἔγεμεν ὁ λόγος, ὃν ἐποι-
ήσατο περὶ τούτων καὶ
[- - -]ΡΩC

- 7 (col. XI) W [...]ΟΥ., ἀλλὰ γόη[τες πάν-]
τε[ς ε]ύρίσκοντα[ι] κατὰ
τὸν ὑφηγημένον τρό-
[πον] ἀποθεω[ρο]ύ[μ]ε-
5 νοι, μακρὰν ἀ[πέ]χοντες
τοῦ τῶν δεόντων λέγειν
περὶ φιλίας ἢ τῶν λοιπῶν
ὅσα συντεί[ν]κει πρὸς τὸ
βιώσαι μακαρίως. ὅθεν
10 δὴ καὶ Φιλίσταν καλῶς
ἐκ μειρακίου κατακοσ-
μηθένθ' ὑπὸ τοιούτου

More against Praxiphanes

20d Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.3

If these things are constantly observed, Zopyrus, I think it becomes clear that Praxiphanes was far from saying something reasonable about friendship and having an appropriate attitude in the deaths of friends and that his discourse is full of contradiction . . .

But all charlatans are discovered, when they are observed in the way indicated, being far from saying anything necessary about friendship and the rest of what pertains to living happily.

[εῖ]δον λόγ[ο]ν μέχρι τε-
 λευτῆς, ὥσπερ] καὶ δε[ό]ν-
 15 [τως τὸν οὐ]δεμίαν πω
 [κακίαν λαβόντα ΚΑ

quindecim fere lineae ceciderunt

col.17 [καὶ αἰεὶ μεμνημένον, κα-]
 1 θ' ὃν ἔζη χρόνον, τοῦ φυ-
 σικοῦ τέλους καὶ οὐθὲν
 ἐλλιπόντα τοῦ ἀρίστου
 βίου παρὰ τὸ μὴ τυχεῖ[ν]
 5 τῶ[ν] παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖ[ς]
 περιβλέπτων, ἐπὶ δὲ
 τοῦ παρόντος οὐθὲν
 ἔχοντα δυσχερὲς οὐ-
 δ' εἰ[ς] τὸν λοιπὸν αἰῶνα
 10 σχ[ή]σοντα· καὶ αὐτοὺς
 ἐπινοοῦντας, ὅτι με-
 τέχομεν φίλ[ο]υ...ΥΜ
 [.....]ΟΝ κατὰ [τ]ὰ [αὐ]τὰ
 [.....]ΥΧΑ...Ε[...]
 15 [.....]ΑΤΑΞΙ..ΤΟ[...]
 16 [...]ΜΗ ἐπὶ μὲν Τ[....]
 18 [...]ΚΑΝΟΙ[.....]
 [...
 [...

col.18.1 [γ]έγονεν ἥπερ ἐ[π]ὶ τῷ
 τὸ στερέμνιον ἡ[ρ]θαι
 τὸ λυπούμενον.

*De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. 11c Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De papyro
 vid. app. 20b, de col. 15.3-12 etiam Heylbut 1876 p. 9*

col. 15.1 [τούτ]ων δὲ τε[τ]ηρημένων *Capasso* : [τούτ]ων δὲ π[ρ]ο[ε]ιρημένων
Crönert p. 70 col. X.1 7-8 τὴν π[α]ρήκουσαν ἔχειν *Heylbut p. 9* 13 [-
 - -]ΡΩC : [ὅτι ἄκ]ρως *Crönert p. 70 col. X.13* col. 16.6 τοῦ τῶν
 δεόντων λέγειν *Capasso* : τοῦ τῶν δεόντων <τι> λέγειν *Usener 1887 p.*
93.21 et Crönert p. 70 col. XI.6 et n. 343 7 περὶ φιλίας ἢ *PHerc. 1027,*
apogr. Neapolitanum, apogr. Oxoniense, Capasso : περὶ φιλίας <καὶ> *Crönert*
p. 70 col. XI.7 13 [εῖ]δον λόγ[ο]ν *Capasso* [δι]αλογισμοῦ *Usener 1887 p.*
93.23, Usener 1977 p. 365 (s.v. κατακοσμεῖν) et p. 423 (s.v. μειράκιον) : εἰ-
 δ[ον] ὕμνου *Crönert p. 70 col. XI.13* 14 ὥσπερ] *Capasso* : ὥστε] *Crönert p.*

Therefore I saw that Philistas was beautifully adorned with such reasoning from childhood until death, as if he must not have acquired any vice . . .

Having always recalled, during the time of his life, the purposes of nature and in no way abandoning the best life by not achieving what is held in esteem by the many, and having no annoyance at present and in the future. And they, seeing that we share friendship . . . according to the same . . .

It has occurred, rather than because of the removal of the solid body that suffers . . .

90 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

70 col. XI.14 16 [κακίαν Capasso : [αἰτίαν Crönert p. 70 col. XI.16 col.
17 *media pars linearum 1-3, in apogr. Oxon. tantum servatur* 10 αὐτοὺς
Capasso : αὐτοὺς Crönert p. 70 col. XII.10 12-13 ...ΥΜ Ι [.....]ΟΝ κατὰ [τ]ὰ
[αὐ]τὰ Capasso : [ε]ὐσύμφωνον] ὄν Crönert p. 70 col. XII.12-13 16-17 [...
]ΜΗ ἐπὶ μὲν Τ[....] Capasso : ΜΗ ἐπὶ μὲν τ[οῦ][παρόντος Crönert p. 70
col. XII.16-17

Praxiphanis vita reprehendenda,
ut opus eius testatur

20e Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.4 (*PHerc.* 1027 coll. 18.3-21 pp. 192-95
Capasso)

7 (col. XIII.3-19) W ὥς ὁ μὴ
το[ι]οῦτος γινόμενος
col. 18.5 ἐ[π' ἄλ]λων [σπ]ουδαίων
[....]ΤΗΙ ἄλλοῖον ἐαυ-
τὸν εἰσάγει οὖν ἐν τῷ
σ[υ]γγράμματι Πραξι-
φάνης· κακὸν μὲν ἐξά-
10 γ[ει] τὸν ἴδιον [βί]ον, μο-
χθ[ηρ]ῶς δὲ φίλοις συ[ν]-
αγαστραφῆσεται ΟΥ[.]
...ΛΟΥΝ γνη[σ]ίως Τ[.]
Α δὲ [κ]αὶ παντ[.....]
15 [..][..]ΕΡ.ΑΥ[.....]
[.]....ΑΓΕΙΠ[.....]
[.....]ΑΡ[...][Α[.....]
[- - -]ΕΠΙΑΝ[- - -]
[- - -].ΛΛΑ.[- - -]

col. 19.1 ΓΕ[...].ΤΟΙC...Μ[...].
δεῖν, προσκόπτοντας
δ' οὐκ ὀλίγοις τῶν κατὰ
φύσιν ὑπ' αὐτῶν γινο-
5 μένων καὶ ἀσυνεργή-
τοις οὔσι πρὸς τὸ κατεπεῖ-
γον τῶν χρειῶν διὰ
τὴν ὑποκαθημένην
ἀοριστίαν κατὰ τε τὰς
10 ἐπιθυμ[ί]ας καὶ τοὺς φό-

The Life of Praxiphanes was Blameworthy,
as his Work Indicates

20e Carneiscus, *Philistas* 2.4

... as he who is not in such condition in the presence of other serious men ... In his written composition, Praxiphanes introduces himself as different. He leads his private life badly and will behave poorly towards his friends ... really ...

Taking offense at not a few things done by them according to nature and at things that cannot be helped in respect to the compelling necessity of needs because of the fundamental indeterminacy towards desires and fears and among many. . .

- βους καὶ τὴν ἐν πολ-
 λο[ῖς...].[...].IAM[...]
 KE[.....].IANΠ.[...]
 .[.....]ΥME.[...]
 15 [.....]ENOΥ[...]
 [- - -].ANΩ[...]
 [- - -]ÇTH.[...]
- col.20 ὃν ὁρῶμεν εὐρηκέ-
 1 [ναι περὶ τ]ῶν [κ]υριωτά-
 των δι[αλ]όγισμα γνήσι]-
 ον παρ' αὐτῇι, λελυκότ[α]
 πᾶν τὸ ματαίως ἡμᾶς
 5 παρενοχλοῦν καὶ εὐχα-
 ριστοῦντα τῷ περιγεγο-
 νότι κουφισμῷ διὰ τὸ
 μέγαν εἶναι καὶ ...[...]
 ΠΟΝ οἰκείον πᾶν ΟΝ.ΟΥ
 10 ΦΟ[.]Ο[.] ποιοῦντα....
 ΘΑΙ χωρὶς τοῦ καὶ τὸ μ[ῆ]
 πι[σ]τεῦον Λ..ΗΜ[...].
 ΠΑ[.....].[.....]
 [.....]
- col.21 τὸ σύγγραμμα τὸ κα]-
 1 τὰ κ[ακ]ὰς δ[όξ]ας γινό[με]-
 νον καὶ δεῖγμα καθ[ε]σ-
 τηκὸς τῆς καθ' ὅλον τὸν
 βίον φαύλης διαγωγῆς
 5 καὶ φίλοις οὐ τῆς ἀρίστης
συναναστροφῆς· KEINON
 ΤΕΠΟ...ΟΥΝΤΑς ὥς κα-
 λῶς ἐν ταῖς φίλων τελευ-
 ταῖς ἀ]νεστρέφετο καὶ
 10 οὔτ' ἄφιλον οὔτ' ἀνήμε-
 ρον ἔπρ]αξέν τι [κ]ατὰ
 [τὸν τοι]οῦτον κα[νό]-
 [να οὐδὲ μ]αταίως ἐα[υτ]ὸν

Whom we see to have found a genuine reasoning about the most important matters in (philosophy), having resolved all that bothers us needlessly and being thankful for the relief that has occurred because of being big and ... everything proper ... making ... without failing to persuade ...

The written composition based on bad opinions and being a show of bad behavior during the whole life and of not the best relationship to friends . . . That he behaved well in the deaths of friends and did nothing unfriendly or crude according to such a norm, nor did he annoy himself needlessly.

[ἡνώχλησ]εν· ΕΥΦ.[.].
 15 [- - -]ΩC..
 [...]

libri finis (subscriptio)

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. 11d Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De papyro vid app. 20b, de col. 18.7-10 etiam Heylbut 1876 p. 9

col. 18: *media pars linearum 3-7 periit, in apogr. Oxon. tantum servatur* 6 [πράτ]τηι *coniecit in adnotatione critica Capasso* : [δεικν]ύηι *Crönert p. 179 (Nachtr. ad col. XIII.6)* 7-12 ἐξά[γει] *Heylbut p. 9* : ἐν τῷ Ι σ[υ]γγράμματι Πραξιφάνης· κακὸν μὲν, <ὄς> ἐξαπατᾶ τὸν ἴδιον [υῖ]όν, μ[ολχθ]ηρῶς δὲ φίλοις συν[α]ναστραφήσεται ΟΥ : *Crönert p. 71 col. XIII.7-10 et n. 344, qui p. 179 (Nachtr. ad col. XIII.10) post Πραξιφάνης intellegit λέγοντα et orationem directam* “κακὸν μὲν ἐξαπατᾶ τὸν ἴδιον υῖόν, μοχθηρῶς δὲ φίλοις συναναστραφήσεται”, κτλ. : “κακὸν μὲν ἐξά[γει] τὸν ἴδιον [βί]ον, μολχθηρῶς δὲ φίλοις συν[υ]λναστραφήσεται” *prop. Gaiser ap. Capasso ad loc.* 12 post ΟΥ *nulla littera cecidisse Capasso videtur* 14-17 καὶ παντ[ελῶς οὐ φιλή]σ[ε]ι ὥσπερ ἐαυ[τόν· ἔπειτα] δὲ εἰ[σάγει Πραξιφάνης] παρέχ[οντα] *Crönert p. 71 col. XIII.14-17, sed vestigia obstant, iuxta Capasso* col. 19.11-13: ἐν πολλοῖς ἀλ[ο]γείαν [τε καὶ] Ι κε[νοδο]ξίαν ΠΙ.... *dubitanter Crönert p. 71 col. XIV.11-13, qui in lin. 12 ἀδια]ληψίαν etiam prop. (p. 179, Nachtr. ad col. XIV.12), sed vestigia obstant, iuxta Capasso* col. 20.1 ὃν ὀρώμεν εὐρηκέ[ναι περὶ τ]ῶν *Crönert p. 71 col. XV.1 : ante ΩN septem fere litterae ceciderunt iuxta Capasso* 8-11 καὶ .C .. ΠΟΝ οἰκεῖον πᾶν ΟΝ.ΟΥΙ φόβον ποιοῦντα.... ΙΘΑΙ *Crönert p. 71 col. XV.8-11, qui in adnotatione 346 prop. dubitanter etiam* καὶ τὸ χαλεπὸν οἰκεῖον πᾶν <τ>ὸν νοῦν τ’ ἀφοβον ποιοῦντα γενέσθαι col. 21.6-7 [ἐ]κείνόν Ι τ’ ἐπ[αιν]οῦντας *Usener 1887 p. 93* : κείνον Ι τε πολ[υ]ωροῦντας *Crönert p. 71 col. XVI.6-7 et adn. 347* 10-11 ἀνήμειρ[ον] ἔπρ[α]ξεν *Capasso* : ἀνήμειρ[ον] φρ[ά]ζειν *Crönert p. 71 col. XVI.10-11* 12-13 κα[νό]λ[να οὐδὲ μ]αταίως *Capasso* : καλ[ὸν ἐνόμ]ι[ζεν οὐδὲ μ]αταίως *Crönert p. 71 col. XVI.12-13* 14 [ἡνώχλησ]εν *Capasso* : [ἡνωχλῶν] *dubitanter prop. Gaiser ap. Capasso ad loc.* ἐν εὐφρ[οσύνηι *Crönert p. 71 col. XVI.14 post lin. 15 unius lineae vestigia*

DE HISTORIA

21 Marcellinus, *Vita Thucydidis* 28-30 (p. 24.137-148 Piccirilli)

Μὴ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ ὅτι ἐγένοντο Θουκυδίδαι πολλοί, οὗτός τε ὁ Ὀλόρου παῖς, καὶ δεύτερος δημαγωγός, Μελησίου, ὃς καὶ Περικλεῖ διεπολιτεύσατο· τρίτος δὲ γένει Φαρσάλιος, οὗ μέμνηται Πολέμων ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἀκροπόλεως, φάσκων

ON HISTORY

21 Marcellinus, *Life of Thucydides* 28-30¹

28 Let us not be ignorant that there were many (named) Thucydides: this one was a child of Olorus,² a second a demagogue, son of Melesias,³ who was active in politics against Pericles.⁴ A third was Pharsalian by birth, whom Polemon recalls in his book *On*

αὐτὸν εἶναι πατρὸς Μένωνος· τέταρτος ἄλλος Θουκυδίδης 5
 ποιητής, τὸν δῆμον Ἀχερδούσιος, οὗ μέμνηται Ἀνδροτίων
 18w29 ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι, λέγων εἶναι υἱὸν Ἀρίστωνος. συνεχρόνισε
 δ', ὥς φησι Πραξιφάνης ἐν τῷ περὶ ἱστορίας, Πλάτωνι τῷ
 κωμικῷ, Ἀγάθωνι τραγικῷ, Νικηράτῳ ἐποποιῷ καὶ Χοιρίλῳ
 30 καὶ Μελανιππίδῃ. καὶ ἕως μὲν ἕζη Ἀρχέλαος, ἄδοξος ἦν 10
 ὥς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, ὥς <ὁ> αὐτὸς Πραξιφάνης δηλοῖ, ὕστερον
 δὲ δαιμονίως ἐθαυμάσθη.

*De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. II Preller, fr. 10 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De
 textu vid. Casaubonum ap. Stephanum 1588 = 1594 p. 25, Casaubonum 1589
 p. 662, Meursium 1617, Bekker 1832 pp. 5.30-6.4, Poppo 1843 pp. XVII-XVIII,
 Ritter 1845 pp. 131-32, Stahl 1886, Jones 1942 p. XV, FGrHist IIIC 696 33b*

the Acropolis, saying that his father was Memnon.⁵ A fourth was Thucydides the poet, who was Acherdousian by deme, whom 29 Androtion recalls in the *Atthis*, saying that he was a son of Ariston.⁶ He lived⁷ at the same time as Plato the comic playwright,⁸ Agathon the tragedian,⁹ Niceratus the epic poet¹⁰ and Choirilus¹¹ and Melanippides,¹² as Praxiphanes says in his book *On History*.¹³ And until Archelaus was living,¹⁴ (Thucydides) was unknown for the most part, as Praxiphanes makes clear, but later he was admired like a god.¹⁵

¹ See discussions in Harles 1793 p. 503, Visconti 1811 p. 230 n. 3, Preller 1842 pp. 18, 20, Ritter 1845 pp. 13-14, Ritschl 1866 pp. 411-15, Wilamowitz 1877 pp. 326-27, Hirzel 1878 pp. 46-49, Schöll 1878 pp. 433-51, Susemihl 1891, I pp. 145-46 et n. 742, Hirzel 1895 p. 311 n. 1, Rohde 1914 pp. 106-08 n. 3, Wilamowitz 1919 p. 12, Christ-Schmid 1920 p. 80, Jacoby in *FGrHist* III b Supplement [Text] p. 163-64, Supplement [Notes] p. 145-46, Bux 1939 coll. 1460.46-1461.34, Brink 1946 p. 24, Luschkat 1954/55 pp. 14-58, Mazzarino 1966 pp. 513-5, Arrighetti 1968 pp. 81-85, Huxley 1969 pp. 13-14, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 112, Davies 1971 pp. 53-4, Momigliano 1974 pp. 66-73, Angeli – Colaizzo 1979 p. 96, Fornara 1983 pp. 131-32, Piccirilli 1985 pp. 110-118, Arrighetti 1987 pp. 187-88, 211-14, Angeli 1988 p. 285-869, Rossetti-Furiani 1993 p. 675, Tuplin 1993-94 pp. 181-97, Harding 1994 p. 183, Cameron 1995 p. 196, Gigante 1998, Canfora 1999 pp. 49-65, Gigante 1999 pp. 59-60, Corradi in this volume.

² Thucydides, son of Olorus, is the famous historian of the Peloponnesian War and lived in the 5th cent. BC.

³ Piccirilli writes ‘Milesius,’ following the manuscripts and Bekker 1832 pp. 5.31-32, but I prefer the correction ‘Melesius’ adopted by Meursius 1617, because all the other sources refer to this politician with this spelling, which is normally used also by modern scholars.

⁴ Bibliography on Thucydides, son of Melesias (or Milesias), in Piccirilli 1985 pp. 110-11 n. 139.

⁵ Bibliography on Thucydides, the Pharsalian, in Piccirilli 1985 pp. 111 nn. 140-41.

⁶ Thucydides as poet is quoted only by Marcellinus’ source Androtion, but he is probably recognizable also under unidentified personages named Thucydides and quoted in several other sources (bibliography in Piccirilli 1985 pp. 111-12 nn. 142-143); see also Harding 1994 p. 183.

⁷ Scholars wonder who is the subject of this verb, whether the Thucydides, historian and son of Olorus, quoted first in the list, or the last one, the unknown poet Thucydides (Ritter 1845 pp. 14 and 133; Jacoby in *FGrHist* III b Supplement [Text] p. 163-64, Supplement [Notes] p. 145-46, see discussion in Tuplin 1993-94 p. 182 and n. 2). Piccirilli 1985 pp. 112-13 is doubtful. I agree with Tuplin 1992-94

98 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

1 *de variis Thucydidibus* cf. *POxy.* 13.1611 fr. 1 col. 5.102-20, *Schol. Aristoph. Ach.* 703a-d et *Vesp.* 947b 2 *de Thucydide, Olori filio, historico scripserunt Marcell. Vita Thucyd.* 2, 16, 54, 55, *Thucyd. Vita Anonima* 1, 10, *Suda* Θ 414 s.v. Θουκυδίδης, *POxy.* 15.1800 fr. 2 col. 2.65-67 2-3 *de Thucydide Melesii filio Theopompus* 115 fr. 91 *FGrHist*, *Plutarchus, Pericles* 8.5 et 11.1, *Satyrus* fr. 16 *Schorn* 4-5 *Polemon* fr. V *Preller* p. 40 (= fr. 5 *FHG* 3 p. 117) 6-7 *Androtion* 324 fr. 57 *FGrHist* 9 *de titulo* περὶ ἱστορίας cf. *Theophrasti* περὶ ἱστορίας 727.8 *FHS&G* et Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα 727.7 *FHS&G* 8-9 *Plato comicus* T4 *PCG* 7 p. 431 9 *Niceratus Heracleota* nr. 564 *Suppl. Hell.* p. 278 *Choerilus* T5 *PEG* 1 pp. 188-89 10 *Melanippides* 757-766 *PMG* pp. 392-395

1-12 *delevit Ritter* pp. 131-32 2 Μελησίου *Meursius, quem sequor* : Μιλησίου *codd.*, *quod servant Bekker* pp. 5.31-32 et *Piccirilli ad loc.* 3 διεπολιτεύσατο *codd.* : ἀντεπολιτεύσατο *Casaubonus* : συνδιεπολιτεύσατο *vel* συνεπολιτεύσατο *Stephanus* 8 Ἀρίστωνος *codd.* : Ἀριστίωνος *Davies* p. 54 9 ἐν τῷ περὶ < Ἀρχελάου > ἱστορίας *Ritschl* p. 413 Χοιρίλῳ *Casaubonus* : Χοιριδίῳ *codd.*, *Piccirilli* 10 *post* Μελανιππίδῃ *addidit* καὶ Αρχελάῳ *Visconti* p. 230 n. 3 ἕως *scripsi* : ἐπεὶ *codd. et edd.* Ἀρχέλαος *delevit Visconti* p. 230 n. 3 11 <ὁ> *addidit Stahl* (*proposuerat Poppo*)

pp. 181-82, Canfora 1999 pp. 49-65, and Corradi in this volume that Praxiphanes wrote about Thucydides the historian, but I do not agree that Praxiphanes spoke of him at the Macedonian court of Archelaus.

⁸ About the comic poet Plato (5th-4th cent. BC), see Piccirilli 1985 pp. 114-15 n. 145.

⁹ About the tragic poet Agathon (5th-4th cent. BC), see Piccirilli 1985 p. 115 n. 145.

¹⁰ Niceratus, born in the middle of the 5th cent. BC, was an epic rhapsodic poet who defeated the epic poet Antimachus of Colophon (the poet admired by Plato) in a competition at the Lisandrean feasts on Samos (*FGrHist* III C 696 33c); about him see Piccirilli 1985 p. 115 n. 145.

¹¹ Piccirilli 1985 p. 115 -16 n. 146 maintains the name *Choiridios* from the manuscripts although he is aware that it is a *lapsus* of the author for the name of the epic poet *Choirilus*, born in the middle of the 5th cent. BC.

¹² Dithyrambic poet, born around 480 BC, see Piccirilli 1985 p. 116 n. 146.

¹³ This title can be interpreted differently: as a dialogue on poets like **22** (Preller 1842 p. 21, Hirzel 1895 p. 311, Wehrli (Prax) p. 112, Corradi's article in this volume, it is not excluded by Tuplin 1993/44 p. 183-84), or as a historical monograph on king Archelaus (Ritschl 1866 p. 413), a book on historiography (Mazzarino 1966 p. 514 and more recently Tuplin 1993/44, conclusion at p. 196), or one on literary critical and grammatical inquiry (Crönert 1906 p. 176 and more recently Gigante 1988 and 1999 p. 60 n. 22). See Matelli's article in this volume.

¹⁴ My translation follows a corrected reading: in the edition of the text I changed the manuscript reading ἐπεὶ into ὥς, considering that, after LSJ, the temporal meaning of ἐπεὶ is 'after that,' 'since,' 'when,' 'from the time when' (always with reference to some later time): a sense that I cannot understand in this context. Neither can I understand a causal meaning of ἐπεὶ ("at cause of Archelaus"). Scholars interpret that, according to Praxiphanes, Thucydides visited Pella where he met the five named poets (Wilamowitzt 1887 pp. 353-61, Hirzel 1878 pp. 46-49, Hirzel 1895 p. 311 n. 1, Brink 1946 p. 24, Wehrli (Prax) p. 112; Arrighetti 1987 pp. 211-14; Tuplin 1993-94; Corradi in this volume.). Tuplin 1993-94 pp. 188-89 thinks that Thucydides might have visited Pella after Euripides' death (407/06 BC) and before Timotheus' arrival or during a temporary absence of his. I prefer to follow Aly: he thinks that Marcellinus truncated Praxiphanes' text, the sense of which probably was that some of the named poets contemporary with Thucydides visited Archelaus at Pella, but Thucydides never did, because he was not very famous during Archelaus' lifetime (Aly 1954 col. 1777.34-37). This interpretation gives sense to Marcellinus' text, where we do not find evidence that Praxiphanes presented Thucydides in dialogue with poets at Archelaus' court.

¹⁵ About the tradition of Thucydides' late fame created by Praxiphanes according to a Peripatetic *topos*, see Tuplin 1993-94 pp. 189-91 and Corradi's paper in this volume. Archelaus was king of Macedonia, where Euripides also seems to have spent his last years, according to the Peripatetic Satyrus (among his uncertain fragments in the edition F *34 Schorn).

GRAMMATICA

vid. **9A-C**

De Isocrate et Platone de poetis disserentibus

22 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 3.8 (p. 197.4-7 Marcovich)

^{11 W} ὁ δ' οὖν φιλόσοφος (*scil.* Πλάτων) καὶ Ἰσοκράτει φίλος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτῶν Πραξιφάνης ἀνέγραψε διατριβὴν τινα περὶ ποιητῶν γενομένην ἐν ἀγρῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι ἐπιξενωθέντος τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam Preller p. 15, fr. 2 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

1 *De Platone et Isocrate vid. Plat. Phaedr. 278e 2-3 cf. Isocr. Panath. 34*
Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ποιητῶν αὐθις ἐροῦμεν, ἥν μή με προανέλη τὸ γῆρας·
περὶ γὰρ σπουδαιοτέρων πραγμάτων ἔχομεν τι λέγειν ἢ τούτων

2 συνέγραψε *P*

GRAMMAR¹

see **9A, 9B, 9C**

Plato's and Isocrates' Discussion about Poets

22 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 3.8²

Indeed the philosopher (Plato) was also a friend of Isocrates. And Praxiphanes records a discussion about poets³ taking place at Plato's country place,⁴ with Isocrates as guest.⁵

¹ With regard to Praxiphanes and his contemporaries, 'grammar' has a peculiar meaning, as is shown by the texts included in this section. See Matelli's article in this volume.

² See discussions in Harles 1793 p. 503, Preller 1842 pp. 15-7, 21, Ritter 1845 pp. 13-14, Steinhart 1873 p. 268 (nr. 50), Susemihl 1891, I p. 145-46 et n. 741, Hirzel 1895 pp. 310-11, Wilamowitz 1919 p. 106, Jensen 1923 pp. 96-7, Rostagni 1926 p. 288 n. 1, Walsdorff 1927 p. 39, Aly 1954 coll. 1775.34-64, 1782.20-23, Dahlmann 1953 p. 7 n. 2, Dahlmann 1963 p. 558, Ferrero 1963 p. 95 n. 105, Capovilla 1967 p. 45 n. 1, Pfeiffer 1968 p. 136, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 109, Janko 1991 p. 57 n. 300 and p. 58, Rossetti-Furiani 1993 p. 673 and pp. 674-75, Bagordo 1998 p. 20 n. 8, Janko 2000 p. 153, Tulli 2007 p. 312, Dorandi, Matelli and Vallozza in this volume.

³ Scholars wonder if here the source is quoting the subject of the discussion between Plato and Isocrates or the title of the *diatribè*.

⁴ Vallozza in the article *The διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν of Praxiphanes in the testimony of Diogenes Laertius*, published in this volume, thinks that Praxiphanes is here describing the gardens of the Academy as the ideal place for the discussion of Plato and Isocrates on poets, taking inspiration from Plato's *Phaedrus*. She argues that a wider context (including paragraph 3.7 of Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers*) derives from Praxiphanes' dialogue *On Poets* (even the quotation from Eupolis, *Astrateutoi*, 36 Kassel-Austin and *Silloi* of Timon of Phlius, *Silloi* nr. 804 Suppl. Hell. pp. 378-79 = 30 Di Marco). Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers* 3.7: "Having returned to Athens, he (scil. Plato) lived in the Academy, which is a gymnasium outside the walls, in a grove named after a certain hero, Hecademus, as is stated by Eupolis in his play entitled *Shirkers*: 'In the shady walks of the divine Hecademus.' Moreover, there are verses of Timon which refer to Plato: 'Amongst all of them Plato was the leader, a big fish, but a sweet-voiced speaker, musical in prose as the cicadas who, perched on the trees of Hecademus, pours forth a strain as delicate as a lily.' Thus the original name of the place was Hecademy, spelled with e. Indeed the philosopher (Plato) was also a friend of Isocrates. And Praxiphanes records a discussion about poets taking place at Plato's country place, with Isocrates as guest." (transl. by Hicks 1938 vol. 1 p. 283).

Brink 1946 fr. 3, Aly 1954 col. 1779.25, Prax. fr. 20 Wehrli.

De numerando et numeribus in Platonis *Timaeo* 17a

23A Proclus, *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria* I (17a) 5 c (p. 14.20-28 Diehl)

^{19W} (Plat., *Tim.* 17 a : εἷς δύο τρεῖς· ὁ δὲ δὴ τέταρτος ἡμῖν, ὦ φίλε Τίμαιε, ποῦ τῶν χθές μὲν δαιτυμόνων, τὰ νῦν δὲ ἐστιατόρων;) Πραξιφάνης δὲ ὁ τοῦ Θεοφράστου ἐταῖρος ἐγκαλεῖ τῷ Πλάτῳ πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι πρόδηλον ὄν καὶ τῇ αἰσθήσει γνώριμον τῷ Σωκράτει περιέθηκε τὸ εἷς δύο 5 τρεῖς· τί γὰρ ἐδεῖτο τοῦ ἀριθμεῖν ὁ Σωκράτης, ἵνα γνῶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀπηντηκότων εἰς τὴν συνουσίαν; δεύτερον δέ, ὅτι τὸ τέταρτος ἐξήλλαξε καὶ οὐ συμφώνως τοῖς προειρημένοις· ἀκόλουθον γὰρ τῷ μὲν εἷς δύο τρεῖς τὸ τέτταρες, τῷ δὲ τέταρτος τὸ πρῶτος δεύτερος τρίτος. 10 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ ἐκείνου μῦθος.

pergit in 23B

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. V Preller, fr. 6 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

De Platonis elocutione vid. etiam Dicaearchum fr. 42 Wehrli (= 48 Mirhady) et Demetrium Phal. 133 SOD 3 Theophrastus 18 nr. 17 FHS&G 8-10 De numeris cardinalibus et ordinalibus cf. Dionysium Thracem, Ars Grammatica 12.21-22 (Uhlig p. 44.2-5) Τακτικὸν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ τάξιν δηλοῦν, οἷον πρῶτος δεύτερος τρίτος. Ἀριθμητικὸν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀριθμὸν σημαίνειν, οἷον εἷς δύο τρεῖς

4 ἐγκαλεῖται Πλάτῳ *M* 7 ἀπηντηκότων *M* τὸ *om. M* 9 <ἀήθως> καὶ *Radermacher* : καὶ <ἐξήνεγκεν> *vel sim. verb. Kroll ap. Diehl ad loc. p. 14*

23B Porphyrius, *In Timaeum*, fragmentum I, apud Procl. *In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria* I (17a) 5 c (pp. 1.1-2.11 Sodano)

continuat 23A

Ὁ δέ γε φιλόσοφος Πορφύριος ἀπαντᾷ πρὸς αὐτὸν (*i. e.* Πραξιφάνην) κατὰ πόδας, πρὸς μὲν τὸ δεύτερον, ὅτι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἐστὶ τοῦτο συνηθείας, κάλλος περὶ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ἐργαζομένης· ὁ γοῦν Ὅμηρος πολλὰ τοιαῦτα εἶρηκεν· ἔξ μὲν γὰρ φησι διὰ πτύχας ἦλθε δαίζων χαλκὸς ἀτειρής, 5

⁵ It is worth remembering that Hieronymus wrote *On Isocrates* (38A White) and *On Isocratean Figures* (39 White).

On Numbering in Plato's *Timaeus* 17a

23A Proclus, *Commentaries on Plato*, *Timaeus* I (17a) 5 c¹

(Plato *Tim.* 17A One, two, three – but where, my dear Timaeus, is the fourth of our guests from yesterday, our host of today?) Praxiphanes the companion of Theophrastus criticizes Plato, first, because he sets out the “one, two, three”² although it was obvious already and known to Socrates through his perception. Why was there need for Socrates to count in order to know how many were present for the meeting? Second, he changes to “fourth”,³ which is inconsistent with what is said before. For “four” would follow “one, two, three”, but “fourth” follows “first, second, third.” This, however, is Plato's story.

¹ See discussions in Harles 1793 p. 503, Mützell 1833 p. 279 n. *, Preller 1842 pp. 23-24, Hirzel 1895 p. 414 n. 4, Susemihl 1891, I p. 145 n. 739, Zeller 1921 p. 899, Wilamowitz 1919, II p. 106, Walsdorff 1927 p. 39, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 113, Aly 1954 coll. 1781.46-1782.23, Festugière 1966 p. 42.

² ‘One’, ‘two’, ‘three’ are cardinal numbers.

³ ‘Fourth’ is ordinal, judged inconsistent with the previous series of cardinal numbers in a same context.

23B Porphyry, fr. 1 in Proclus, *Commentaries on Plato*, *Timaeus* I (17a) 5 c¹

The philosopher Porphyry answered him (Praxiphanes) word for word, on the second point, that this is the common practice in Greek producing beauty in the expression. Indeed, Homer says many such things. For he says:

Through six folds the tireless bronze went cutting.²

ἐπεσχέθη δὲ ἐν τῇ ἑβδομάτῃ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι· φησὶν οὕτως
καὶ ἄλλοθι πολλαχοῦ· ἔχει μὴν καὶ αἰτίαν ἐνταῦθα ἢ
ἐξαλλαγή· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ παρόντας ἦν δεικνύντα ἀριθμεῖν·
δεικτικὸν γὰρ τὸ εἶς δύο τρεῖς· τὸν δὲ ἀπόντα - δεικνύναι
γὰρ ἀδύνατον ἦν - διὰ τοῦ τέταρτος ἐσήμηνε· καὶ γὰρ 10
ἐπὶ ἀπόντος χρώμεθα τῷ τέταρτος· πρὸς δὲ τὸ πρότερον,
ὅτι ἄρα τοσοῦτων μὲν παρόντων, ὅσους ἦν παραγίνεσθαι
εἰκός, περιττὸν τὸ ἀριθμεῖν, ἐλλείποντος δέ τινος, ὃν
ἀγνοοῦμεν δι' ὀνόματος, ἔμφασιν ἔχει τοῦ λείποντος ἢ
τῶν παρόντων ἀπαρίθμησις, ὥς ἐπιποθοῦσα τὸν λοιπὸν 15
καὶ ὥς ἐνδέουσα μέρει τοῦ παντὸς ἀριθμοῦ. τοῦτο οὖν
καὶ ὁ Πλάτων ἐνδεικνύμενος πεποίηκε τὸν Σωκράτην καὶ
ἀριθμοῦντα τοὺς παραγενομένους καὶ ἀπαιτοῦντα τὸν
ὑπολειπόμενον· εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐγίγνωσκε κακεῖνον καὶ ἦν
δυνατὸν δηλοῦν τῷ ὀνόματι, εἶπεν ἂν τυχόν, ὅτι Κριτίαν 20
μὲν ὀρᾷ καὶ Τίμαιον καὶ Ἑρμοκράτην, τὸν δεῖνα δὲ οὐχ
ὀρᾷ· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ξένος ἦν ὁ ἀπὼν καὶ ἀγνῶς αὐτῷ, διὰ τοῦ
ἀριθμοῦ μόνον αὐτός τε οἶδεν ὅτι ἄπεστι, καὶ ἡμῖν ποιεῖ
καταφανὲς τοῖς ὕστερον τοσοῦτον γεγονόσι.

5-6 Hom. II. 7.247-8 ἔξ δὲ διὰ πτύχας ἦλθε δαΐζων χαλκὸς ἀτειρής, / ἐν
τῇ δ' ἑβδομάτῃ ῥινῶ σχέτο

4 ἐργαζόμενον Kroll (apud Sodano) 6 post ὀνόματι interpunxit Mazzucchi
(per colloquium) post ἑβδομάτῃ interpunxit Sodano 12 παραγενέσθαι
P 17 Σωκράτη M, N, adprobante Praechter¹ (apud Sodano) p. 514 18
ἀπαιτεῖσθαι P 19 ἀπολειπόμενον P 24 τοσοῦτω Kroll

De coniunctionibus expletivis

24 Demetrius, *De elocutione* 55-58 (Chiron pp. 20-21)

Τοῖς δὲ παραπληρωματικοῖς συνδέσμοις χρηστέον,
οὐχ ὥς προσθήκαις κεναῖς καὶ οἷον προσφύμασιν ἢ
13 W παραξύσμασιν, ὥσπερ τινὲς τῷ “δή” χρῶνται πρὸς οὐδὲν
καὶ τῷ “νυ” καὶ τῷ ἑπρότερον†, ἀλλ’ ἂν συμβάλλωνταί τι
56 τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ λόγου, καθάπερ παρὰ Πλάτωνι

But it stopped on the “seventh”. So he says often also elsewhere. In fact, the change has a reason here (in Plato), for it was possible to count the ones present while pointing. For it is possible to point “one, two, three.” But the absent one – it was not possible to point him out – he indicates with “fourth.” We also use “fourth” for the absent one. As to his earlier point, that with so many present it was superfluous to count how many were there, the numbering of those present gives emphasis to the missing one, whom we do not know by name, adding a longing for the remaining one inasmuch as there is a need for the (missing) part of the whole number. This, then, is why Plato has Socrates number off those present and ask about the remaining one. If he knew that one and was able to make him clear by name, he would have said so, because he sees Critias and Timaeus and Hermocrates, but he does not see that one. Since the missing one was a guest and unknown to him, he himself knows that he is absent only by the number, and he makes that clear to us with what happens later.

¹ Discussions in Simon-Suisse 1839 p. 54-56 et n. 2, Preller 1842 p. 24, Aly 1954 coll. 1781.57-1782.23, Sodano 1964b pp. 42-45, Festugière 1966 p. 42.

² *Il.* 7.247-8.

On Complementary Particles¹

24 Demetrius, *On Style* 55-58²

Complementary particles must not be employed as empty
55 additions and, so to speak, excrescences or expansions, as some
use ‘indeed’ (*dē*) for no reason, and ‘now’ (*ny*) and ‘first of all’
(*proteron*)³, but only if they contribute to the magnitude of the
56 speech, as in Plato,

ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς
καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ

ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἴξον ἑὺρρεῖος ποταμοῖο.

Ἄρκτικὸς γὰρ τεθεὶς ὁ σύνδεσμος καὶ ἀποσπάσας τῶν
προτέρων τὰ ἐχόμενα μεγαλείον τι εἰργάσατο. αἱ γὰρ 10
πολλαὶ ἀρχαὶ σεμνότητα ἐργάζονται. εἰ δ' ὧδε εἶπεν· “ἄλλ'
ὅτε ἐπὶ τὸν πόρον ἀφίκοντο τοῦ ποταμοῦ”, μικρολογοῦντι
57 ἐώκει καὶ ἔτι ὡς περὶ ἑνὸς πράγματος λέγοντι. λαμβάνεται
δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ παθητικοῖς πολλάκις ὁ σύνδεσμος οὗτος, ὥσπερ
ἐπὶ τῆς Καλυψοῦς πρὸς τὸν Ὀδυσσεά· 15

Διογενὲς Λαερτιάδῃ πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
οὕτω δὴ οἰκόνδε φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

εἰ γοῦν τὸν σύνδεσμον ἐξέλοις, συνεξαιρήσεις καὶ τὸ
πάθος. καθόλου γάρ, ὥσπερ ὁ Πραξιφάνης φησὶν, ἀντὶ
μυγμῶν παρελαμβάνοντο οἱ τοιοῦτοι σύνδεσμοι καὶ 20
στεναγμῶν, ὥσπερ τὸ “αἶ αἶ” καὶ τὸ “φεῦ”· καὶ ποιόν
τί ἐστίν, ὡς αὐτός φησι, τὸ “καὶ νύ κ”· “ὀδυρομένοισιν”
58 ἔπρεψεν ἔμφασίν τινα ἔχον οἰκτροῦ ὀνόματος. οἱ δὲ πρὸς
οὐδὲν ἀναπληροῦντες, φησί, τὸν σύνδεσμον ἐοίκασι τοῖς
ὑποκριταῖς τοῖς τὸ καὶ τὸ πρὸς οὐδὲν ἔπος λέγουσιν, οἷον 25
εἴ τις ὧδε λέγοι

Καλυδὼν μὲν ἦδε γαῖα Πελοπίας χθονός, φεῦ,
ἐν ἀντιπόρθμοις πεδί' ἔχουσ' εὐδαίμονα, αἶ αἶ.

ὡς γὰρ παρέλκει τὸ “αἶ αἶ” καὶ τὸ “φεῦ” ἐνθάδε, οὕτω
καὶ ὁ πανταχοῦ μάτην ἐμβαλλόμενος σύνδεσμος. 30

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. IV Preller, fr. 4 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

1 *De coniunctionibus expletivis Tryphon ap. Apollonium Dyscol. De coniunctionibus (Schneider p. 247.23-25 = fr. 41 Von Velsen p. 35) Ὁ Τρύφων ἐν τῷ ὄρῳ βουλόμενος καὶ αὐτοὺς (sc. τοὺς παραπληρωματικούς) ἐμπεριλαβεῖν φησί “καὶ τὸ κεχηνὸς τῆς ἐρμηνείας ἐστίν ὅπου παραπληρῶν”, Dionys. Thr. Ars Grammatica 20 (Uhlig pp. 86-88, 96-100) Σύνδεσμός ἐστι λέξις συνδέουσα διάνοιαν μετὰ τάξεως καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας κεχηνὸς δηλοῦσα (πληροῦσα Moschopoulos et mscr. recc.). Τῶν δὲ συνδέσμων οἱ μὲν εἰσι συμπλεκτικοί, οἱ δὲ διαζευκτικοί, οἱ δὲ συναπτικοί, οἱ δὲ παρασυναπτικοί, οἱ δὲ αἰτιολογικοί, οἱ δὲ ἀπορρηματικοί, οἱ δὲ συλλογιστικοί, οἱ δὲ παραπληρωματικοί ... Παραπληρωματικοὶ δὲ εἰσιν ὅσοι μέτρου ἢ κόσμου ἕνεκεν παραλαμβάνονται. εἰσὶ δὲ οἶδε· δὴ ῥά νύ ποῦ τοί θήν ἄρ δῆτα πέρ πώ μὴν ἂν αὖ νῦν οὔν κέν γέ, Philoxenus fr. ** 689 Theodoridis (ap. Apoll. Dyscol. De coniunctionibus [Schneider pp. 248.12-13]) οὐδὲν οὔν κωλύει, καθότι καὶ ὁ †Φιλόπονος† (fortasse Φιλόξενος, vid. Schneider 1902 p. 249 et Theodoridis p. 80) ἀπεφήνατο, συνδέσμους*

the mighty – indeed (*men dē*) – Zeus in heaven,⁴
and in Homer

But when – indeed (*dē*) – they arrived at the ford of
the fair-flowing river.⁵

The particle placed at the beginning of the sentence and separating what follows from what precedes creates something magnified. For many beginnings create solemnity. If he had said, “but when they arrived at the ford of the river,” he would have seemed to be using trivial language and to be describing a single occurrence.
57 This particle (*dē*) is also often used with regard to feelings, as in the case of Calypso to Odysseus:

Son of Laertes, sprung from Zeus, Odysseus of
many devices, must you, just like that (*houtō dē*),
go home to your own homeland forthwith?⁶

If you remove the particle, you will also take out the feeling. In general, as Praxiphanes says, such particles used to be employed in place of moans and groans, such as “*ai ai*” and “*pheu*”. And is of a certain quality – as he says – the expression *kai ny k*: fitting for people lamenting since it suggests in some degree a term
58 of mourning.⁷ But those who use particles to fill something out with no point, he says, are like actors who employ exclamations casually, as though one were to say:

This ground is Calydon, having blessed fields, *pheu*,
on the straights across from Pelops’ land, *ai ai*.⁸

For as the *ai ai* and the *pheu* are dragged in, so is the connective when it is inserted everywhere indiscriminately.

¹ See *32 and *33a-c.

² See discussions in Muret 1789, Harles 1793 p. 503, Preller 1842 pp. 21-22, Schoemann 1862 p. 9, Steinthal 1890 p. 265, Susemihl 1891 I p. 145 n. 739, Mayer 1910 pp. 118-19 and nn. 1-2, Pohlenz 1939 p. 161 n. 1, Aly 1954 coll. 1779, 63-1780.30, Grube 1961 p. 75, Wehrli (Prax.) pp. 110-11, Chiron 1993 pp. 96-98, Rossetti-Furiani 1993 p. 675, Lallot 1998 pp. 231-56, Matthaïos 1999 pp. 582-84, Chiron 2001 pp. 243-46.

καλείσθαι τοὺς παραπληρωματικούς. καὶ τοῦτό φησι δεδωκώς, ὅτι οὐδέν συνδεσμικὸν δηλοῦσιν, *Tryph. fr. 57* (*Von Velsen pp. 43-44 ap. Apoll. Dysc. De coniunctionibus* [Schneider pp. 247.22-258.17, 248.14-249.20]), *Schol. Vat. in Dionysium Thracem* (Hilgard pp. 290.30-291.28), *PLitLond. 182.10-121* (Wouters pp. 72-73) 6 *Plat. Phaedr.* 246e 8 *Hom. Il.* 14.433 et 21.1 9 ἀρκτικὸς γὰρ τεθεὶς ὁ σύνδεσμος: cf. *Schol. in Iliadem* 19. 56-58c, 58 b²/c² (Erbse 1975 pp. 583.38-584.46) 16-17 *Hom. Od.* 5.203-04 22 καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδν φάος ἡλίιοι *Il.* 23.154, *Od.* 16.220, 21.226; καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως *Od.* 23.241, cf. *Schol. in Iliadem* 23.153 ὑπερβολικῶς οὖν εἶπε τὸ “καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδν φάος” (Erbse 1977 p. 395.70-73), *Eust. Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 4.704.8 (comm. in *Il.* 23.153-54) 27-28 *Eurip. Meleager* 46 fr. 515 TrGF 5.1 p. 556 prior versus etiam in *Arist. Rhet.* 3. 9 (1409b8)

1 καὶ τοῖς παραπληρωματικοῖς δὲ *consensus codd. Gregorii Corinthii* 2 προσφύμασιν *P* : προσφύγμασιν *M* παραξύσμασιν : παραξύμβασιν *M* (*om. Lat.*) 3 τῷ “δὴ” *P* : τὸ “δὴ” *M* 4 πρότερον *PM Greg.^{FV}* : πότερον *Greg.^R* : *delevit Radermacher 1901* : ποτε *Muret (recepit Grube 1961)* : περ *Roshdestwenski* ἀλλ' ἂν συμβάλλωνταί *P² Greg.* : ἀλλ' ἐὰν συμβάλλωνται *M* : ἄλλαι συμβάλλονται *P¹ (inmo conferunt Lat.)* 4-5 τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ λόγου *PM Greg.^R* : τῷ λόγου μεγέθει *Greg.^F* : τῷ λόγῳ *Greg.^V* 8 ἐϋρρείος *P* : ἐυρείος *M* 9 ἀποσπάσας *Finckh* : ἀποσπασθεὶς *PM Greg.* 10 τὰ ἐχόμενα *om. Greg.* μεγαλείον τι *PM* : μεγαλειότητα *Greg.* : σημείωσαι *P in mg.* 14 δὲ *PM Greg.^V* : *om. Greg.^F* ἐπὶ παθητικοῖς *M (in passionibus Lat.)* : παθητικοῖς *P* : παθητικῶς *Greg.* 17 ἐς πατρίδα *M* : ἐπατρίδα *P* 18 ἐξέλοις *PM Greg.^V* : ἐξέλης *Greg.^F* 19 Τί φησι Πραξιφάνης *P in marg.* 21 ὥσπερ καὶ *M* φεῦ φεῦ *Greg.^F* 21-22 ποιόν τί ἐστίν, ὥς *interpunxit Mazzucchi (per colloquium)* : ποῖόν τί [ἐστίν]; ὥς *interpunxit Chiron* 22 post κ' *interpunxit Mazzucchi (per colloquium)* 26 λέγοι *PM* : λέγει *Greg.* 30 σύνδεσμος *Greg.* : *om. PM*

In Homerum

25 *Commentarium in Iliadem* 2.763 (*POxy.* 8.1086.11-18 p. 60 nr. 6 Matelli)

- 20w11 [ἵπποι μ(έν) μέγ' ἄρισται· τὸ σημεῖον ὅτ]ι πρ(ὸς) τὸ δεύτερον πρότερον ἀπήντησεν. τὴν δ' ἀ-
12 [πόδειξιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἠθισμένου ὁ Ἀρ]ίσταρχος πεποίηται πρ(ὸς) Πραξιφάνην· ἐκεῖνος
13 [γ(ὰρ) θαυμάζει τὸν Ὀδυσσεά ἐπὶ τῷ] παρηγορικῶς ὠμληκότα τῇ μητρὶ κα-

³ Editors suspect that the reading *proteron* is wrong. Chiron quotes Dionysius Thrax, *Ars Grammatica* 20.8 p. 97 Uhlig, showing that it is absent from his list of complementary particles.

⁴ Plat. *Phaedr.* 246e8: “The great – indeed – leader in heaven.”

⁵ *Il.* 14.433 and 21.1.

⁶ *Od.* 5.203-04 (translation by Murray-Dimock 1995).

⁷ Praxiphanes seems here to refer to Homeric verses like *Iliad* 23.154, and *Odyssey* 16.220, 21.226, 23.241; see *Schol. in Iliadem* 23.153 where the verse containing *kai ny k'* is considered hyperbolic.

⁸ Praxiphanes is here quoting Euripides, *Meleager* fr. 515 *TrGF* (5.1 p. 556), verses quoted in a different context by Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 9 (1409b8).

On Homer

25 Anonymous, *Commentary on Iliad* 2.763¹ (*POxy.* 8.1086)²

“By far the best horses.”³ The critical mark is here because he responded first to the second question.⁴ Aristarchus gave his demonstration to Praxiphanes on the basis of his (*scil.* Homer’s) usage.⁵ For he (*scil.* Praxiphanes) had wondered that Odysseus, after speaking consolingly to his mother, asked about

110 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- 14 [τὰ τὴν τελευταίην περὶ Τηλεμάχου κ(αὶ)] Πηνελόπης
 ἐρωτῆσαι, ἐπειδήπερ ὥς ἐνι μάλιστα
 15 [ἀκοῦσαι θέλει τὰ συμβάντα ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ. ἡ δέ, φησὶν,
 ἡ Ἀντίκλεια συνετωτάτη
 16 [οὔσα εὐθὺς περὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα καταγίνεται· δι' ἣν αἰτίαν
 ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος, δεικνὺς ὅ-
 17 [μοια, ἀποφαίνει ὅτι ὁμηρικῶς λέγ]ει ἡ Ἀντίκλεια.
 σημειοῦται δέ, ὅτι διὰ παντὸς
 18 [ὁ ποιητῆς οὕτως πρ(ὸς) τὸ δεύτερον πρότερον ἀπαντᾷ
 κατὰ ἰδίαν συνήθειαν.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. 3 Brink; 86 2T Lundon 1999 pp. 641-42, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De textu vid. Hunt 1911 pp. 77-99 (adiuvante Wilamowitz), Aly 1954 coll. 1779.23-36, Erbse 1969 p. 165, Lundon 2002 pp. 78 et 80, Nünlist 2008 p. 332 (Erbse secutus)

11 *Diplē in Veneto A (Il. 2.763)* 11-12 et 18 πρ(ὸς) τὸ δεύτερον πρότερον *cf. Aristonicum in, e.g., Schol. Il. 2.621* υῖες ὁ μὲν Κτεάτου, <ὁ δ' ἄρ' Εὐρύτου, Ἀκτορίωνε>: ὅτι παρὰ τὸ ἠθισμένον πρὸς τὸ πρότερον ἀπήντηκεν, *Schol. Il. 2.629a* πρὸς τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν, πότερον ὁ Μέγης ἀπώκησεν, ἢ ὁ Φυλεύς, ὃ καὶ <Ὀ>μηρικώτερον· Ὅμηρος γὰρ αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ δεύτερον πρότερον ἀπαντᾷ, *Schol. Od. 21.278* ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο ἔπος] ὁ Ἀντίνοος. πρὸς γὰρ τὸ δεύτερον τὸ πρότερον *V alia locutio* τὸ δεύτερον πρῶτον *apud Scholia exegetica, e.g., Schol. Il. 15.333b* ἦτοι ὁ μὲν νόθος· τῆς κατὰ μέρος ἱστορίας (*scil. Il. 15.333-6*) χάριν ἢ ἐπανάληψις. δαιμονίως δὲ τῇ ἐξαλλαγῇ χρῆται· ἄνω (*scil. Il. 15.330*) γὰρ πρὸς τὸ δεύτερον ὑπαντήσας νῦν πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον *T, Schol. Od. 3.467* τὸ δεύτερον πρῶτον εἶπεν, ὥς τὸ “οὐδ' ἀπέλυσε θυγάτρα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεδέξατ' ἄποινα” (*Il. 1.95*), *Schol. Od. 15.6* πρὸς τὸ δεύτερον πρῶτον ἀπήντησεν. καὶ ἀντίπτωσις ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ μαλακοῦ ὕπνου δεδμημένον *H 13-16 Od. 11.163-203, cf. Schol. Od. 11.177*

11 [ἵπποι μ(ὲν) μέγ' ἄρισται· τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι] *Wilamowitz ap. Hunt p. 81 : diplen ante ἵπποι addidit Lundon 1999 p. 641 : ἡ διπλῇ ὅτι Massimilla in sermone suo* 12 *suppl. Matelli cf. lin 18 : ἀπολογία τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἐντεῦθεν ὁ Ἀρ[ίσταρχος Wilamowitz ap. Hunt p. 81 : τὴν δ' ἀκόλουθον ἐξήγησιν ἐντεῦθεν ὁ Ἀρ[ίσταρχος Massimilla in sermone suo* 13 γ(ὰρ) *Massimilla in sermone suo ἐπὶ τῷ in app. Erbse, quem Lundon 1999 p. 641 et Lundon 2002 p. 80 secutus est : διὰ τὸ suppl. Wilamowitz ap. Hunt ὠμιληκότα Brink : ὠμειληκότα lectio papyri, quam Hunt p. 81 et Wehrli receperunt* 13-14 κα[τὰ τὴν τελευταίην περὶ Τηλεμάχου κ(αὶ)] *suppl.*

Telemachus and Penelope (only) at the end, even if he wished above all to hear out what had happened to them in his absence. But he (*scil.* Praxiphanes) says that she was most intelligent and started right away from this last news.⁶ This is the reason why Aristarchus, presenting similar passages, shows that Anticleia spoke according to the Homeric usage.⁷ He marks the text with a critical sign because the Poet, according to his own practice, always gives the first answer to the second question.

¹ See discussions in Hunt 1911 pp. 77-99 (with Wilamowitz's help, for this reason quoted also Hunt-Wilamowitz), Schmidt 1912 pp. 644-45 et n. 5, Körte 1913 p. 252, Harder 1914 p. 10, van Leeuwen 1917 p. 301, Howald 1917-1918 pp. 419-20, Bassett 1920 pp. 47-48 et 55, Christ-Schmid 1920 pp. 80 et n. 3, 267 et n. 5, Gudeman 1921 coll. 628.45-48, Bassett 1923, 45-46 et n. 7, Bassett 1938 pp. 120-21 et n. 10, 124-25 et n. 17, 127, Brink 1946 pp. 21, 23, 25, Aly 1954 col. 1779, 20-62, Haffter 1956 pp. 79-87: 79 n. 2 and 86 n. 4, Podlecki 1969 p. 125, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 113, Lamedica Nardi 1977 pp. 133-35, Richardson 1980 pp. 282 et nn. 58, 59, McNamee 1981 p. 249, Montanari 1981 p. 103 n. 6 (= 1995 p. 45 n. 6), van Thiel 1989 p. 14 n. 4, van Thiel 1992 p. 26, Rossetti-Furiani 1993 pp. 673-64, Lundon 1997 p. 84 n. 41, Schmidt 1997 p. 11, Haslam 1998 p. 63, Lundon 1999, 2T pp. 639-646, Lundon 2001 pp. 827-39, Lundon 2002 pp. 104-105, Nünlist 2008 pp. 332-33, Matelli 2009 pp. 42-60. Massimilla presented some conjectures in his paper at the september 2007 conference in Rome which remains unpublished: they are quoted in my critical apparatus of the Greek text.

² This papyrus, dated 1st cent. BC, is preserved in the British Library (inv. 2055 r). See Oldfather 1923 nr. 722, Milne 1927 nr. 176, Pack² nr. 1173 = MP³ nr. 1173, LDAB nr. 2287.

³ The poet had asked the Muse to tell him about the men "themselves and horses," but the following narration starts with the last ones, i.e. the horses (*Iliad* 2.763).

⁴ The text reported in the papyrus is informing us that the Alexandrian librarian Aristarchus (2nd cent. BC) marked *Iliad* 2.763 as a peculiar verse with a critical symbol, and is going to explain the reasons why he marked it.

⁵ This translation follows my edition, where the gaps are filled differently than by Hunt-Wilamowitz 1911 (followed by almost all the following editors). Nünlist 2008 p. 332 translates Hunt-Wilamowitz's text "Aristarchus based his [defence of Homer] against Praxiphanes [on this passage]." I do not recognize any negative critique on Homer's verse in the following lines about Praxiphanes' judgments. By my interpretation, Aristarchus seems to have opened an ideal dialogue with the Peripatetic about Homer's practice of answering first to the second question, which Praxiphanes may have first observed when commenting *Odyssey* 11.163-203.

⁶ These lines relate to Praxiphanes' observations about *Odyssey* 11.163-203

Wilamowitz : κα[τὰ(.) περὶ Τηλεμάχου κ(αὶ)] *Erbse* 15 [ἀκοῦσαι θέλει τὰ συμβάντα ἐν τῇ ἀ]πουσίᾳ *suppl. Wilamowitz* : [± 30(.) ἀ]πουσίᾳ *in textu Erbse* : [ἀκοῦσαι θέλει (vel καταδοκεῖ) τὴν τούτων τύχην ἐν τῇ ἀ]πουσίᾳ *in app. Erbse* : [± 23 ἐν τῇ ἀ]πουσίᾳ *Lundon 1999 p. 642* 16 [οὔσα εὐθὺς περὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα κατα]γίνεται *Wilamowitz* : [οὔσα περὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα κατα]γίνεται *Aly col. 1779.32* : [± 30(.)] γίνεται *Erbse* : [οὔσα εὐθὺς περὶ αὐτὰ κατα]γίνεται *Wehrli spatium vacuum post* γίνεται 16-17 *suppl. Matelli* : ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος δεικνὺς ὅ[τι ± 25] ἢ ἡ Ἀντίκλεια *Hunt* : ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος δείκνυσ<ι> *Schmidt 1912 pp. 644-45 n. 5* : δείκνυσ<ι>, ὅ[τι εὐνουςτάτη ἐστὶ τῇ Πηνελόπ]ῃ ἢ Ἀντίκλεια *Aly col. 1779.33-34* : ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος δείκνυσ<ι> ὅ[τι.....] ἢ ἡ Ἀντίκλεια *Wehrli* : ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος δεικνὺς ὅ[± 26] εἰ ἢ Ἀντίκλεια *Erbse p. 165.17 in textu, in app. monens* ἢ *potius quam*]αι ἢ Ἀντίκλεια, *unde proposuit* Ἀρίσταρχος δεικνὺς ὅ[περ δεῖ ἀποφαίνει ὅτι ὀρθῶς (vel δηλοῖ ὅτι ὁμηρικῶς) λέγ]ει vel ὅ[μοια σχήματα δηλοῖ ὅτι ὀρθῶς λέγ]ει vel *similia* : ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος δείκνυσ<ι>, ὅ[τι εὐνουςτάτη ἐστὶ τῇ Πηνελόπ]ῃ ἢ Ἀντίκλεια *Aly col. 1779.33-34 conferens schol. Od. 11.177* 18 [ὁ ποιητῆς οὕτως πρ(ὸς) τὸ δεύτερον πρ]ότερον ἀπαντᾷ *Lundon 1999 in app. p. 643* : [ὁ ποιητῆς οὕτως εἰς τὰ ὕστερα πρ]ότερος ἀπαντᾷ *Wilamowitz ap. Hunt p. 83* : [ὁ ποιητῆς οὕτως εἰς τὸ δεύτερον πρ]ότερος ἀπαντᾷ *Wehrli* : [ὁ ποιητῆς οὕτως εἰς τὰ δεύτερα πρ]ότερος ἀπαντᾷ *Aly col. 1779.35-36* : [ὁ ποιητῆς οὕτως πρ(ὸς) τὸ δεύτερον πρ]ότερος ἀπαντᾷ *dubitanter Erbse in app.*

Litterarum iudicia

26 POxy. 65.4457 fr. 2 (p. 63 Haslam)

].
].ῖωναν...
].ίδαι γὰρ.
]τοὺς υἱεῖς παριδών.
 5]υσι[.]ω() ἐν τῷ π(ερὶ) τῆς πο[
].κ() Πραξιφ(άν-) ἔφασαν αὐτὸν δια[
].εισδοσι. ε.....αιμ(εν)ομ[.
].νεί...
]...]

6 *De Praxiphane vid. etiam 3T Lundon 1999 pp. 646-7, cf. Praxiphanis opera De poematibus (18 nr. 2, 27) et fortasse De poetis (18 nr. *3, 22)*

3 Εὐφρονίδαι *suppl. Coles (in adnotatione ad lin. 7 Haslam p. 63: Euphronida Aristophanis Byz. magister fuit, vid. Aristoph. Byz. T1 Slater p. 1.4)* 5 Διον]υσι[ό]δω(ρος) *Haslam in app. (Dionysodorus Aristarchi discipulus fuit, vid. RE V s.v. Dionysodorus 18 col. 1005.4-37 et LGGA s.v. Dionysodorus)* π(ερὶ)

where Odysseus asks his mother last what most of all he wished to know and where Anticleia answered first to the last of her son's questions: the Peripatetic scholar discovered this double *deuteron proteron* and interpreted the double inversion of a natural behaviour as consistent with each of the two personages' characters: Odysseus, even if he wished above all to hear out what had happened to his family in his absence, decided to speak consolingly to his mother while the intelligent Anticleia immediately understood her son's unspoken desire.

⁷ Following Erbse 1969 (see *ad loc.*), I fill differently this gap rather than Hunt-Wilamowitz 1911, whose text is translated by Nünlist 2008 p. 332 as follows: "For this reason Aristarchus showing [what is necessary, makes it clear that] Anticleia speaks in the right order]." I think that our source is here telling the history of the birth of Aristarchus' opinion that the Homeric '*deuteron proteron*' was a habit of Homer's style, an interpretation that the grammarian developed in his ideal dialogue with the Peripatetic philosopher, showing several similar examples of the usage that Praxiphanes had already observed in *Odyssey* 11.163-203 one century before, giving a different explanation.

On Literary Criticism

26 *POxy.* 65 4457, fr. 2¹

... indeed ...

disregarding the sons ...

[Dion]ysi[o]do(rus)² in the work *On Po[etry?]*³

a[nd]⁴ Praxiphanes⁵ said that he ...

¹ This papyrus (3rd cent. AC) is preserved in Oxford, Sackler Library (papyrology Rooms). Observations in Lundon 1999 pp. 646-47, Janko 2000 p. 126 n. 4.

² The reading of this name is uncertain. Haslam 1998 p. 63 proposes 'Dionysodorus' and identifies this person with Aristarchus' pupil Dionysodorus from Troezen, who is described by Cohn 1903 coll. 1005.4-37 and Pagani 2006 in *LGGA* s.v. Dionysodorus.

³ Haslam 1998 suggests filling the gap with *On Po[etics]* or *On Po[litics]*.

⁴ The papyrus presents the abbreviation of a word starting with the letter *k*, which might be interpreted as *k(ai)* 'and' or as *k(atà)* 'against.' Haslam 1998 p.

114 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

τῆς πολίσεως vel πολιτικῆς vel πολιτείας *Haslam in adnotatione* : vid. *Lundon 1999* 6 κ(αὶ) Πραξιφ(άνης) *Haslam in adnotatione, qui dubitanter etiam* κ(ατὰ) Πραξιφ(άνους) *proposuit, vid. Lundon 1999 p. 647* 7 εἰς δόσιν vel εἰσδόσει *Haslam in adnotatione*

Ex libro primo *De poematibus*

27 Philodemus, *De poematibus* 5.2 (*PHerc.* 1425 col. 12.10-35 pp. 139-140 Mangoni)

col.12.10 τῶν το[ί]νων παρὰ τῶι Φι-
 λομή[λω]ι [γ]εγραμμέ-
 νων, οἱ μὲν, οἰόμενοι
 τὸν ἐν τοῖς μύθοις καὶ
 ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡθοποιίαις
 15 κὰν τῇι λέξει παραπλη-
 σίω[ς] ὁμαλ[ί]ζ[ο]ντα ποιη-
 τὴν ἄριστον εἶναι, λέ-
 [γου]σι μὲν ἴσ[ω]ς ἀληθές
 τι, τὸν δὲ ποιητὴν τὸν ἀ-
 20 γαθὸν οὐ διορίζουσι. καὶ
 γὰρ μιμουγράφου καὶ ἀρε-
 ταλόγου [ἢ] πλου συγγρα-
 φέως ἀρετὴν ἂν τις ἐκ-
 θεῖτο ταύτην. καὶ τὸ
 25 παραπλησίως ἀναγκαῖ-
 α τὴν τε λέξιν εἶναι καὶ
 τὰ πράγματα λόγον ἔχει.
 12w Πρα[ξ]ιφάνης δ' ἕτερα μὲν
 [τ]ίνα λέγει περὶ τῆς ἀρε-
 30 τῆς ἐν [τ]ῶι πρώτῳ περὶ
 ποιη[μά]των. Εἰ δ' ἐνίοτε
 καὶ π[ραγ]μάτων ὄντων
 [. . . .]ΙΕ[. . . .] . εἰεῖναι
 [. . . .] . ἔ[τε]ρα [δ]ὲ Δημή-
 35 [τρι]ος ὁ Βυζάντιος πάλιν
 col.13.1 ἔ[γραψεν, ἐπεὶ ... κτλ.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. I Preller, fr. I Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes De textu vid. Dübner 1840 p. 13, Crönert p. 105, Kentenich s.d., Jensen 1919 pp. 7-9, Jensen 1923 pp. 24-25, Capasso 1984 pp. 407-415, Mangoni 1991 pp. 65-82 praesertim p. 76

63 n. 6 is uncertain whether to interpret “and Praxiphanes” (adopted reading) or “against Praxiphanes.”

⁵ Praxiphanes was author of a work *On Poems* (27) and wrote on a discussion among poets (22). See notes on these texts.

From the First Book *On Poems*

27 Philodemus, *On Poems* 5.2¹

Now, of those whose opinions have been recorded by Philomelus,² those who think the best poet maintains the same level in the plots and also in the characters and in the style,³ say something which is perhaps, true, but they do not define the good poet. For someone might also assign this virtue to a writer of mime⁴ or a writer of miraculous anecdotes⁵ or even somehow to a historian. However, the statement that style and actions are similarly necessary is reasonable. On the other hand, Praxiphanes says other things about the virtue (of poems) in his first book *On Poems*,⁶ (for example) that, sometimes even though the actions are (good), (the poem can fail).⁷ Demetrius of Byzantium also wrote different things,⁸ since . . .

¹ See discussions in Preller 1842 pp. 17-20, Gomperz 1890 pp. 1-88, Susemihl 1891, I p. 145 et n. 739, Crönert 1906 p. 105, Sudhaus 1906 p. 276, Jensen 1923 pp. 96-97, Rostagni 1924 p. 7, Cataudella 1929 pp. 244-46, Orth 1932 col. 1315, Jensen 1936 pp. 294-95 n. 4, Aly 1954 coll. 1775.65-776-60, Greenberg 1955 pp. 37-40, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 110, Janko 1991 p. 57 n. 300 and p. 58, Mangoni 1993 pp. 215-19, Gigante 1999 p. 121, Janko 2000 p. 153, p. 269 and n. 2, Del Mastro 2001, Broggiato 2006 p. xxx and n. 51, Ascheri 2009, Dorandi in this volume.

² Philomelus is an unknown author, but see Mangoni 1993 pp. 47-49 for a hypothesis about his school (he might have been an Epicurean or a Peripatetic). Philodemus seems to know Praxiphanes' *On Poems* through him.

³ See Cataudella 1929 pp. 244-46 about the meaning of *homalizein* as “to maintain the same level as...”

⁴ See Sudhaus 1906 p. 276.

⁵ The *aretalogus* seems to be a kind of prose-writer of marvellous divine deeds (Mangoni 1993 p. 216-17).

⁶ Praxiphanes seems to be the first author to compose a work entitled *On Poems*. See Brink 1946 p. 23 n. 2, Dahlmann 1953 p. 92 n. 2, Matelli 2012 *ad loc.* and Matelli in this volume. His work (in more than one book) deals with ‘poems’ (*poiēmata*), a subject that must not be confused with ‘poetry’ (*poiēsis*) in Aristotle's *Poetics*, which includes all mimetic arts. The translation

13 τὸν ἐν τοῖς μύθοις *cf. Arist. Poet. 6 (1450a3-25)* ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ οἶον ψυχὴ ὁ μῦθος τῆς τραγωδίας 14 ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡθοποιαῖς *cf. Arist. Poet. 6 (1450 a 38-b15)* δεύτερον δὲ τὰ ἦθη, [*Arist.*] *Problemata 30 (955a32-35)* διὰ δὲ τὸ ἡθοποιὸς εἶναι (ἡθοποιὸν γὰρ τὸ θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν μάλιστα τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστίν) ὥσπερ ὁ οἶνος πλείων καὶ ἐλάττων κεραυνύμενος τῷ σώματι ποιεῖ τὸ ἦθος ποιούσ τινας ἡμᾶς; *titulum* Ἡθοποιαῖ *inter Arati operum fragmenta: nr. 106 (app.) et 107 Suppl. Hell. p. 39 15-16* ὁμαλίζοντα *cf. Arist. Poet. 15 (1454a26)* 21 μιμουγράφου *cf. Arist. Poet. 1 (1447b9-11), De poet. fr. 72-73 Rose 1886*

10-15 *suppl. Dübner* 16 ὁμαλίζοντα *Mangoni* : [ὁμ]άλιζοντα *Jensen 1923* : ἐκλάμποντα *Dübner, Jensen 1919* : διαλάμποντα *Orth 1932 col. 1315, Jensen 1936 p. 294 n. 4* 18 *suppl. Dübner et Lucignano 1832-1844* 21-22 ἀρεταλόγου *Dübner* 22 [ἡ] πλου *Mangoni p. 79 spatii causa* : [καὶ] πλου *vel* [ἡ] ἄλλου *Sudhaus 1906, Jensen 1919 p. 8, Jensen 1923 p. 25* 24 *post* ταύτην *spatium* καίτοι *perperam Greenberg 1961 p. 38 et n. 29* 28 *suppl. Dübner et Lucignano 1832-1844* 29 [τ]ινα *Dübner et Lucignano 1832-1844, Mangoni 1991 p. 76, Mangoni 1993 p. 140* : τινα *Jensen 1919 p. 9* 31 *spatium post* ποιημάτων (*quod suppl. Dübner et Lucignano 1832-1844*) ἐν δ', ἐνίστε *Dübner 1840* : ἐ[ῶ] δ', ἐνίστε *Jensen 1919 p. 9* : [ἡν] ἐνίστε *Jensen 1923 p. 25* 32 π[ραγ]μάτων *suppl. Dübner et Lucignano 1832-1844* 33-34 *plura non leguntur iuxta Mangoni 1991 p. 76 et Mangoni 1993 pp. 140, 219* 31-34 *aliter alii suppleverunt*: ἐν δ' (δὲ *Preller*) ἐνίστε καὶ πραγμάτων ὄντων καὶ λέξεως κενὸν εἶναι ἀρετῆς τὸ γράμμα *Dübner et Preller p. 19* : ἐνίστε | καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ὄντων | [κακῶν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι | λέγει *Crönert p. 105* : ἐ[ῶ] δ', ἐνίστε | καὶ π[ραγ]μάτων ὄντων | [καὶ] ἡθ[ῶν] οὐκ ἐνεῖναι | ἀρετὴν *Jensen 1919 p. 9* : [ἡν] ἐνίστε | καὶ π[ραγ]μάτων ὄντων | [ἀγαθῶν] οὐκ ἐνεῖναι | φησιν *Jensen 1923 p. 25* : οὐκ ἐνεῖναι *Janko per colloquium* 34 ἔ[τε]ρα *suppl. Kentenich**

In Hesiodi *Operum et dierum* prooemium

28A Proclus, *Commentaria in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, Proleg. Ac (p. 2.7-20 Pertusi)

22a W Ὅτι δὲ τὸ προοίμιόν τινες διέγραψαν, ὥσπερ ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος ὀβελίζων τοὺς στίχους καὶ Πραξιφάνης, ὁ τοῦ Θεοφράστου μαθητῆς, μηδὲ τοῦτο ἀγνοῶμεν· οὗτος μέντοι καὶ ἐντυχεῖν φησιν ἀπροοιμιάστῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ καὶ ἀρχομένῳ χωρὶς τῆς ἐπικλήσεως τῶν Μουσῶν, ἐντεῦθεν 5
οὐκ ἄρα μόνον ἔην ἐρίδων γένος·
καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο πρέπον ἦν, ὥς ἔοικεν, ἀνδρὶ γράφειν ἄνευ σκηνῆς ποιητικῆς ἐγχειροῦντι καὶ πρὸ θυρῶν ὄγκον <οὐκ> ἐπιδεικνυμένῳ περιττόν. ἐπάγεται δέ τινας καὶ τὸ μὴ ἀπὸ

of *poiema* as ‘poesia’ by Mangoni 1993 can be ambiguous.

⁷ The gap prevents precise reconstruction of Praxiphanes’ opinion about the virtue appropriate to poetry; my translation follows the general sense of the sentence. According to Mangoni the best hypothesis is that of Crönert 1906 p. 105 and n. 505, who infers the sense that it is possible to have a good poet even if the actions of the poem are bad. Capasso 1984 p. 408 and Mangoni 1993 p. 219 remark that Jensen’s different reconstruction does not follow the palaeographic evidence, but they agree with its final meaning (Jensen 1919 p. 9 and Jensen 1923 p. 25). The context suggests that Praxiphanes introduced here a peculiar poetic virtue that, in my opinion, has to be recognized in the ‘word-composition’ (*synthesis*) necessary to poems, without which, despite the *pragmata*, there can be no ‘poem’ (*poiēma*).

⁸ Crönert 1906 p. 105, Wehrli 1983 pp. 594b, 598 and Mangoni 1993 p. 52 propose to identify him with the Peripatetic Demetrius of Bizantium, author of almost four books *On Poems*, according to Athenaeus 10.77, 12.71, 14.33, see Ascheri 2009.

On the Preface to Hesiod’ *Works and Days*

28A Proclus, *Commentaries on Hesiod’s Works and Days*¹

Nor are we uninformed that some strike out the preface (of Hesiod’s *Works*), including Aristarchus, who obelizes the lines, and Praxiphanes, the student of Theophrastus.² He (Praxiphanes) says he came upon the book without a preface and beginning without the invocation to the Muses,³ from

Indeed, there was not a single kind of Strife.⁴

This was fitting, it seems, for a man trying to write without a poetic stage and not⁵ displaying an excessive burden before the opening. Some are induced not accept the preface also by the fact that, although he was Boeotian, he had not taken Muses from

τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος λαβεῖν, Βοιωτὸν ὄντα, τὰς Μούσας, ὥσπερ 10
ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ πεποίηκεν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς Πιερίας, εἰς τὸ
μὴ προσίεσθαι τὸ προοίμιον.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. VI Preller; fr. 5 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes
De textu vid. Gaisford pp. 3.20-4.11, Rzach p. 127 app. linn. 1-10, Marzillo pp.
2.19-4.29

1-2 *Crates F 78 Broggiato* (= *Vita Dionys. Perieg. 62 Kassel pp. 72.59-60*) διὸ
καὶ ὁ Κράτης αὐτὰ κατὰ λόγον ἡθέτει, *Plut. Quaest. Conv. 736E* ἄσαντος
δὲ τὰ πρῶτα τῶν Ἔργων “οὐκ ἄρα μόνον ἔην Ἑρίδων γένος”, ἐπή-
νεσεν ὡς τῷ καιρῷ πρεπόντως ἀρμοσάμενον, *Ps.-Herodrianus De Figuris 7*
Hajdú p. 109.18 (= *RhGr 3 p. 89.12*) εἴ γε γνήσιον Ἡσιόδου τὸ προοίμιον
τίθεμεν 2 *Aristarchos fr. 5 Waeschke* 6 *Hes. Opera et Dies 11* 10-12
Paus. Graeciae Descriptio 9.31.4 (*Rocha-Pereira pp. 59.28-60.3*) Βοιωτῶν δὲ
οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἑλικῶνα οἰκοῦντες παρειλημμένα δόξῃ λέγουσιν ὡς ἄλλο
Ἡσίοδος ποιήσειεν οὐδὲν ἢ τὰ Ἔργα· καὶ τούτων δὲ τὸ ἐς τὰς Μούσας
ἀφαιροῦσι προοίμιον, ἀρχὴν τῆς ποιήσεως εἶναι τὸ ἐς τὰς Ἑρίδας
λέγοντες· καί μοι μόλυβδον ἐδείκνυσαν, ἔνθα ἡ πηγὴ, τὰ πολλὰ ὑπὸ
τοῦ χρόνου λελυμασμένον· ἐγγέγραπται δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ Ἔργα *Ad montem*
Heliconem sita est urbs Thespieae, vid. Pausaniam, Graeciae Descriptio 9.26.6
Θέσπια ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος τὸν Ἑλικῶνα ὥκισται, *ubi IG 7.1752.6-7 reperta est* (= **15*)
12-13 *Hes. Theogonia 1*

1 ἔγραψαν ὥσπερ γὰρ *Q* 2 στοίχους *CD* : στοίχους ἢ λόγους *O* :
λόγους *Q* 3 ἀγνοῶμεν *U¹ CDO cf. 21.1* : ἀγνοοῦμεν *QU Pertusi* 4 καὶ
om. O φησιν *om. QU* 7 ὡς : καὶ *O* 8 πρὸς *O* ὄγκων *U* 8-9 <οὐκ>
ἐπιδεικνυμένῳ *Mazzucchi per colloquium* ὄγκον ... περιττόν : ὄρκος
ἐπιδεικνυμένων καὶ ὄγκον περιττόν *O* 9 καὶ *om. O* 10 τοῦ *omm. QO*
καλεῖν *UCDO* Βοιώτιον *O* 11 πεποίηκεν *omm. CD* τῆς *om. O* 12
προίεσθαι *Q*

28B Iohannes Tzetzes, *In Hesiodi Opera et Dies Commentarium*, app.
Proleg. Ac 7-14 (p. 1 Pertusi)

22b W

Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν· ἰστέον ὅτι Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ ἕτεροι
ὀβελίζουσι τὸ προοίμιον, καὶ Πραξιφάνης ὁ μαθητὴς
Θεοφράστου, λέγων ἀπροοιμιάστῳ βιβλίῳ ἐντυχεῖν,
ἀρχομένῳ ἐντεῦθεν·

οὐκ ἄρα μόνον ἔην Ἑρίδων γένος.

5

De Praxiphane vid. etiam LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

5 Hes. Opera et Dies 11

Helicon, as he did in the *Theogony*, but from Pieria.

¹ See discussions in Harles 1793 p. 503, Ritschl 1866 p. 413, Classen 1829 p. 8; Preller 1842 p. 25 n. *, Susemihl 1891, I p. 145 n. 739, Maass 1892 pp. 213-14 n. 4, Leo 1894 pp. 6-7; 14, Mazon 1928 pp. 76-78, Wilamowitz 1928 pp. 39-41, Van Groningen 1948 p. 295, Aly 1954 col. 1780.42-56, Lattes 1954 pp. 166-72, Capovilla 1967 p. 46, Pfeiffer 1968 p. 220 et n. 2 p. 241, West 1978 pp. 95 and 136-37, Faraggiana 1978 & 1981, Calame 1996 p. 54 n. 18, Broggiato 2006 p. 239, Matelli 2009 pp. 32-42. See Martano 2004 pp. 465-70 about Hieronymus of Rhodes on Hesiod's *Shield*

² Aristarchus, librarian in Alexandria (2nd BC), read Praxiphanes' works; see **25**.

³ Praxiphanes seems to have visited a place where he found a manuscript of Hesiod's *Works and Days*. This place was probably nearby Hesiod's hometown or Thespieae, beneath Mount Helicon (the inscription ***15**, bearing the name of Dionousophaeis, son of Praxiphanes, in a military catalogue of *epheboi* comes from this same town). Cf. Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 9.31.4 (p. 59.28-60.3 Rocha-Pereira) "Of the Boeotians those who live around Helicon say that they have ascertained by report that Hesiod did no work other than the *Works and Days*. And they remove the preface to the Muses, saying that the beginning of the poem is the preface to Strife. And they have shown me a piece of lead, where the spring is, most of which has been erased by time: the *Works and Days* have been engraved on it." See Matelli in this volume.

⁴ Hesiod, *Works and Days* 11.

⁵ To give a right sense to this sentence, it seems necessary to add a negation to the verb, which is absent in the manuscripts.

28B John Tzetzes, *Commentary on Hesiod's Works* (Proleg. Ac 7-14, App. p. 1 Pertusi)¹

"Muses from Pieria." It is necessary to know that Aristarchus and others obelize the preface, as does Praxiphanes the student of Theophrastus, who says that he came upon the book without a preface, beginning with the words

Indeed, there was not a single kind of Strife.²

¹ See discussions in Preller 1842 pp. 24-5, Leo 1894 pp. 6-7, Wilamowitz 1928 p. 39, Mazon 1928 pp. 76-77, Van Groningen 1948 p. 294, Aly 1954 col. 1780.50-60, Lattes 1954 pp. 166-72, Capovilla 1967 p. 46-7, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 114, West 1978 p. 95 (critical notes to Hes. *Op.*, vv. 1-10) et pp. 136-37, Calame 1996 pp. 46, 54 and n. 18, Hurst 1996 pp. 62-63 et n. 5, Veneri 1996 pp. 80, 82.

² Hesiod, *Works and Days* 11.

120 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

In quandam translationem Sophoclis
(*Oedipus Coloneus* 900)

29A *Scholium in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum* 900 (p. 43.15-19 De Marco)

23 W σπεύδειν ἀπὸ ῥυτῆρος· ἀντὶ τοῦ βλαύτης· τῶν δὲ ἐξηγησαμένων ἀπάντων αὐτὸ Πραξιφάνης δοκεῖ ἄμεινον ἀποδιδόναι, ἀκούων τὸ ὑπόδημα οἷον τῶν ποδῶν τὸ κάλυμμα. ἀπὸ ῥυτῆρος· ἀπὸ ὑποδήματος ἀντὶ τοῦ ὡς ἔχει σχήματος ἕκαστος. 5

*De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. VII Preller, fr. 8 Brink, nr. 77 *F 1 Bagordo*

1 *Soph. Oed. Col.* 897-900 Οὐκουν τις ὡς τάχιστα προσπόλων μολῶν | πρὸς τούσδε βωμοὺς πάντ' ἀναγκάσει λεῶν | ἄνιππον ἱππότητα τε θυμάτων ἄπο | σπεύδειν ἀπὸ ῥυτῆρος...; 1-2 *cf. Aristoph. Equites* 888-89 Οὐκ, ἀλλ' ὅπερ πίνων ἀνὴρ πέπονθ' ὅταν χεσεῖη | τοῖσιν τρόποις τοῖς σοῖσιν ὥσπερ βλαυτίοισι χρώμαι, *Plat. Symp.* 174a καὶ τὰς βλαύτας ὑποδεδεμένον *cum schol. ad loc. (Greene p. 56), Hesych. Lexicon* ρ 537 (*Hansen 2005 p. 251*), ῥυτῆρι κρούων, 538 (*Hansen 2005 p. 251*) ῥυτῆρος, *Poll. Onomasticon* 7.87 ἢ δὲ βλαύτη σανδαλίου τι εἶδος 4-5 *cf. PHamb.* 128.37-46 *de translatione ex analogia* = ***33b**

***29B** *Suda* B 324 s.v. βλαύτη (t. 1 p. 475.9-10 Adler)

Βλαύτη: εἶδος ὑποδήματος. Σοφοκλῆς· σπεύδειν ἀπὸ ῥυτῆρος. τουτέστιν ἀπὸ βλαύτης· ὡς ἕκαστος ἔχει σχήματος.

Vid. app. 29A

***29C** *Suda* Σ 927 s.v. σπεύδειν (t. 4 p. 417.15-19 Adler)

Σπεύδειν: παρ' Ὀμήρῳ οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχύνειν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνεργεῖν καὶ κακοπαθεῖν. καὶ παροιμία· σπεύδειν ἀπὸ ῥυτῆρος. ἀπὸ ὑποδήματος. ἀντὶ τοῦ ὡς ἔχει σχήματος. ἀπὸ τῆς βλαύτης. Σοφοκλῆς· οὐκοῦν τις ὡς τάχιστα προσπόλων μολῶν. πάντα δ' ἀναγκάσει λεῶν ἄνιππον ἱππότητα τε θυμάτων ἄπο σπεύδειν ἀπὸ ῥυτῆρος. 5

Vid. app. 29A

3-4 ἀπὸ τῆς βλαύτης *scripsi*, *cf. Suda* B 324 s.v. βλαύτη = ***29B** : ἀπὸ τῆς βλάστης *codd. et Adler* 4 οὐκοῦν *Adler* : οὐκουν *Pearson 1924*

Interpretation of Sophocles,
Oedipus at Colonus

29A Scholium on Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus* 900

“To hurry with no harness” (Soph. *OC* 900). Instead of “with no slipper”. Among all the interpreters Praxiphanes seems to give the best interpretation, since he understands it as the shoe, that is, the covering of the feet. “With no harness.” That is, “with no footwear”, instead of “in whatever condition each is in.”¹

¹ Following Praxiphanes’ interpretation, in this verse, saying “with no harness,” Sophocles refers elliptically to the knights and to the horseless people, who both hurry in whatever condition each is in.

***29B** Suda s.v. ‘*blautē*’

“Slipper”. A type of shoe. Sophocles: “To hurry with no harness.” That is, “with no slipper,” in whatever condition each is in.

***29C** Suda s.v. ‘*speudein*’

“To hurry”. In Homer it is not for “to be quick” but for “to be active and to suffer”. And there is the proverb “to hurry with no harness”. “With no shoe,” instead of “in whatever condition each is in.” “With no slipper”. Sophocles: “won’t one of the attendants go as soon as possible [...] and compel all the people, without horse and with horse, to hurry from the sacrifices with no harness.”¹

¹ ***29B-*29C** do not reveal the name of Praxiphanes, but they demonstrate how his remark on *Oedipus at Colonus* 900 had an influence in the lexicographical tradition, where his name got lost.

122 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

De rari alicuius verbi significatione

30A¹ *Lexicon* e codice Coisliniano Graeco 345, s.v. ῥΑζα (Versio codicis B, α 416, p. 556 Cunningham)

²¹W ῥΑζα· ξηρασία. σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐν ἀγγείῳ ὀλίγον ὑγρόν. οὕτως Πραξιφάνης.

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. VIII Preller, fr. 9 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes
De textu vid. Lexica Segueriana VI s.v. ῥΑζα (Bekker p. 348.14-15), Bachmann
1 p. 35.21-22

1 *Apoll. Soph. Lex. Hom. s.v. ῥαζετο (Bekker p. 11.19-21)* ῥαζετο, ἐὰν ψιλῶς, ἐξηραίνετο· καὶ γὰρ ῥαζη τῇ ξηρασίᾳ δηλοῖ (*textus vix sanus*). καὶ κατὰ μετοχήν φησί που ἢ μὲν τ' ῥαζομένη κεῖται ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας (*Il. 4.487*) ἀντὶ τοῦ ξηραινομένη, *Scholia in Od. 11.587 (Dindorf 2 p. 523)* καταζήνασκε· ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥαζω, τὸ ξηραίνω, ῥαζαίνω *B* κατεξήραινεν. ῥαζη ἢ ξηρασία *HV*, *Scholia in Od. 22.184 (Dindorf 2 p. 710)* ῥαζη· μεμολυσμένον τῇ ξηρότητι *HQ* ῥαζη· εὐρῶτι ἢ ξηρασία *V*

30A² Photius, *Lexicon* A 428.2 (p. 50 Theodoridis)

idem ac 30A¹

***30B** *Scholium in Theocritum* 5.109 (sch. 109b p. 178.17-18 Wendel)

ῥαζαι· ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις γὰρ ἐπειδάν τι καταλειφθῇ ξηρανθέν, ῥαζα λέγεται.

Praxiphani vindicant Preller fr. VIII et Brink app. fr. 9

Hesych. Lexicon α 31 (s.v. ῥαζα *Latte 1953 p. 52*) ῥΑζα· ξηρασία. ἄσβολος. κόνις. παλαιότης. κόπρος ἐν ἀγγείῳ ὑπομείνασα

Definitio alicuius carminum generis

31 Hesychius, *Lexicon* δ 1398 (p. 444 Latte)

¹⁴W διατροχάδες· εἶδος ποιήματος, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Πραξιφάνης [ὄνομα κύριον].

De Praxiphane vid. etiam fr. III Preller, fr. 7 Brink, LGGA s.v. Praxiphanes

2 ὄνομα κύριον *secl. Musurus 1514*

On a Rare Word¹

30A¹ *Lexicon from Codex Coislinianus Graecus 345, s.v. Aza*

“*Aza*”. A drying. It indicates a small amount of moisture in a vessel. So Praxiphanes.²

¹ See discussions in Aly 1954 col. 1780.31-41, Capovilla 1967 p. 45 n. 4, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 113-14.

² Cf. Apollonius the Sophist, *Homeric Lexicon* (p. 11.19-21 Bekker) “It is dried,” if thinly, it is dried out. For it makes clear by the dried up *aza*. And it means by extension in a way it lies ‘drying’ by the banks of a river (Homer, *Il.* 4.487) instead of ‘drying’...”

30A² Photius, *Lexicon* a 428.2

“*Aza*”. Same as 30A¹

*30B *Scholium* in Theocr. 5.109

“*Azai*”. In vessels when something dried out is left, it is called “drought” (“*Aza*”).¹

¹ Cf. Hesychius *Lexicon* a 31 “Aridity, dryness. Soot. Ash. Oldness. Dirt which remains in a vessel.” See Aly 1954 col. 1780.31-41, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 114.

Definition of a Peculiar Poetic Genre

31 Hesychius, *Lexicon* s.v. ‘*diatrochades*’¹

Diatrochades.² A kind of poem, as Praxiphanes reports.³

¹ See discussions in Preller 1842 p. 21, Wehrli (Prax.) p. 111, Aly 1954 col. 1777.49-50 and col. 1782.24-47.

² This term is a *hapax legomenon*, nowhere else attested. It is a deverbative noun from *diatrochazein*, which means “ride to and fro, hasten.” Cf. Demetrius Lacon’s use of the verb *entrochazein* (also an *hapax*, which means ‘intervene,’ ‘occur’ always with regard to ambiguity: “occurring ambiguity”) in the second book of his work *On Poems* (2.11 coll. 47.7, 48.7-8, 49.5-6, 51.6 and 2.13 col. 61.5 s. Romeo).

³ The verb ‘*historei*’ indicates that Praxiphanes made personal inquiries about this poetic genre, unknown to us. Is this name related to a special use of the trochaic metre? Or does it refer to a peculiar kind of content, for instance *epinicia* for

III. APPENDIX DE GRAMMATICA (*32-*33)

*32 Porphyrius ap. Simplicium, *In Aristotelis Categorias*, Prooemium (CAG 8 pp. 10.19-11.2 Kalbfleisch)

ὁ δὲ Πορφύριος σκοπὸν εἶναι τοῦ βιβλίου φησὶν ἐν τε τῷ πρὸς Γεδάλειον καὶ ἐν τῷ κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ ἀπόκρισιν περὶ τῶν κατηγορουμένων· αὗται δὲ εἰσιν αἱ ἀπλαῖ φωναὶ αἱ σημαντικαὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, καθὸ σημαντικαὶ εἰσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ καθὸ λέξεις ἀπλῶς. καθὸ μὲν γὰρ λέξεις, ἄλλας ἔχουσι 5 πραγματείας, ἃς ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων ὁ τε Θεόφραστος ἀνακινεῖ καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν γεγραφότες οἷον πότερον ὄνομα καὶ ῥῆμα τοῦ λόγου στοιχεῖα, ἢ καὶ ἄρθρα καὶ σύνδεσμοι καὶ ἄλλα τινά (λέξεως δὲ καὶ ταῦτα μέρη, λόγου δὲ ὄνομα καὶ ῥῆμα)· καὶ τίς ἡ κυρία λέξις, 10 τίς δὲ ἡ μεταφορική· καὶ τίνα τὰ πάθη αὐτῆς, οἷον τί ἀποκοπή, τί ἀφαίρεσις, τίνες αἱ ἀπλαῖ, τίνες αἱ σύνθετοι, τίνες αἱ ὑποσύνθετοι καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα· καὶ ὅσα περὶ ἰδεῶν εἴρηται, τί τὸ σαφὲς ἐν ταῖς λέξεσιν, τί τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές, τί τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ πιθανόν· καθὸ μέντοι σημαντική ἐστίν ἡ 15 λέξις, κατὰ τὰ γένη τῶν ὄντων ἀφορίζεται.

De Porphyrii fragmento vid. fr. 46.1-16 Smith pp. 35-36. Hoc Porphyrii testimonium Theophrasto vindicat editor Theophr. 683 FHS&G

3-16 *haec lineae conferendae sunt cum Theophrasti doctrina* περὶ ἐνδιάθετου καὶ προφορικοῦ λόγου (*vid. Theophr. 673A FHS&G*) *et cum alia, cuius mentionem fecit Ammonius In Arist. De Interpretatione 4 17a1.6 (CAG 4.5 pp. 65.31-66.10) = Theophr. 78 FHS&G cf. ad rem universam Philonem, De congressu eruditionis gratia 149* ἐπειδὴν οὖν περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου διεξέρχωνται μερῶν, τότε οὐ τὰ φιλοσοφίας εὐρήματα παρασπῶνται τε καὶ παρεργολαβοῦσι; ταύτης γὰρ ἴδιον ἐξετάζειν, τί σύνδεσμος, τί ὄνομα, τί ῥῆμα, τί κοινὸν ὄνομα, τί ἴδιον, τί ἐλλιπὲς ἐν λόγῳ,

the equestrian winners? Or to a quick poetic composition, like an improvisation (*diatrochazō* in the sense of ‘hasten’)? Aly 1954 col. 1782.37-47 compares it to the classification of lyric poems after their ‘musical’ classes proposed by Apollonius of Alexandria, the so-called Classifier (3rd-2nd BC), see Pfeiffer 1968 pp. 184-85. Poetic classifications based on formal aspects, like metres or musical classes, are different from literary classification based on differences of content, like the one surely created by Aristophanes of Byzantium (3rd-2nd BC). See 27.

III. APPENDIX ON GRAMMAR (*32-*33)

*32 Porphyry in Simplicius, *On Aristotle’s Categories*, Preface¹

In the (book dedicated) *To Gedalius* and in the (book arranged) *By Question and Answer* Porphyry says that the focus of the book (*i.e.* Aristotle’s *Categories*) is on predicates, and these are the simple sounds that signify things, in so far as they are significant, but not in so far they are simply expressions.² For in so far they are expressions, they belong to other subjects, which are worked up by Theophrastus in *On the Elements of Speech* (or *of the Sentence*)³ and by his associates,⁴ who wrote (inquiring) whether (just the) noun and verb are elements of speech,⁵ or also joints and ligaments⁶ and certain others (*i.e.* articles prepositions etc.) – these too are parts of the expression, but a noun and a verb (are parts) of speech⁷ – and what is ordinary expression, and what is metaphorical, and what are the modifications of it – e.g. what is *apocopē*, what is aphaeresis, what are the simple expressions, what are the composite, what are those formed from composites, and all such things? – and whatever has been said about qualities (of style) – what is clarity in expression, what is grandeur, what is the pleasant and persuasive?⁸ But insofar as an expression is significant, it is distinguished according to the kinds of things there are.

¹ See discussions in Schmidt 1839 pp. 37-39 (nr. 10), Usener 1858 p. 68, Rose 1863 pp. 142-43, Volkmann 1885 pp. 395-96, 533, Rabe 1890 pp. 5-6, 36-45, Schmid 1894 pp. 144-45, Mayer 1910 pp. VI-VII and n. 5, li, 15-16 and n. 2, Stroux 1912 pp. 23-28, Solmsen 1931 p. 247, Regenbogen 1940 col. 1527.46-528.2, Grube 1952 pp. 176-77, Snell 1954 pp. 49-50, Lucas 1968 pp. 201-02, Martin 1974 pp. 248-49: van Bennekom 1975 pp. 408-11, Frede 1978 (= 1987) pp. 317, 328, Janko 1984 p. 180, Hoffmann 1987 pp. 68, 72-73, Schenkeveld

τί πλήρες, τί ἀποφαντόν, τί ἐρώτημα, τί πύσμα, τί περιεκτικόν, τί εὐκτικόν, τί ἀρατικόν· τὰς γὰρ περὶ αὐτοτελῶν καὶ ἀξιωμάτων καὶ κατηγορημάτων πραγματείας ἥδ' ἐστὶν ἡ συνθεῖσα (*vid. paragraphum 148 in app. 9C*) 6 Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων *cf. Dionys. Hal. De Demosthene 48 (= Arist. Tit. 82 nr. 143 Gigon pp. 401-02)* τοῖς πρώτοις μορίοις τῆς λέξεως, ἃ δὴ στοιχεῖα ὑπὸ τινων καλεῖται, εἴτε τρία ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ὡς Θεοδέκτη τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει δοκεῖ, ὀνόματα καὶ ῥήματα καὶ σύνδεσμοι, εἴτε τέτταρα, ὡς τοῖς περὶ Ζήνωνα τὸν Στωικόν, εἴτε πλείω, δύο ταῦτα ἀκολουθεῖ μέλος καὶ χρόνος ἴσα, *Dionys. Hal. De compositione verborum 2.1 (Arist. Tit. 82 nr. 142 Gigon p. 401; Theodectes XXXII 3.5 Baiterus-Sauppe p. 248), 7.1, De Thucydide 22.1-2 Aristoteles tractavit elocutionis "partes" in Poet. 20 (1456b20-21)* Τῆς δὲ λέξεως ἀπάσης τάδ' ἐστὶ τὰ μέρη, στοιχεῖον συλλαβὴ σύνδεσμος ὄνομα ῥήμα ἄρθρον πτώσις λόγος *cf. Arist. Tit. 82 nr. 144 Gigon (ex Quint. Inst. Or. 1.4.18) de syllabis et nominibus vid. PHamb. 128 = *33a, *33b et *33c* 8 πότερον ὄνομα καὶ ῥήμα τοῦ λόγου στοιχεῖα *cf. Arist. Poet. 20 (1457a23-27)* 9 ἄρθρα *cf. Arist. Poet. 20 (1456b38-1457a10), Rhet. ad Alex. 25.1 (1435a34-36) et 25.4 (1435b11-16)* σύνδεσμοι *vid. 24* 10 τίς ἡ κυρία λέξις *cf. Arist. Poet. 21 (1457b3-6) de nominibus propriis vid. etiam 30 et PHamb. 128.46-47 (= *33b)* 11 τίς δὲ ἡ μεταφορική *cf. Arist. Poet. 21 (1457b7-9)* μεταφορὰ δὲ ἐστὶν ὀνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορὰ ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐπὶ εἶδος ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶδους ἐπὶ τὸ γένος ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶδους ἐπὶ εἶδος ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον, *PHamb. 128.37-46 et 59-64 (*33b) de metaphora vid. Theophr. 689A, 689B, 690 FHS&G* τίνα τὰ πάθη αὐτῆς *cf. Arist. Poet. 25 (1460b11-13)* ταῦτα δ' ἐξαγγέλλεται λέξει ἐν ᾗ καὶ γλῶτται καὶ μεταφοραὶ καὶ πολλὰ πάθη τῆς λέξεως ἐστι· δίδομεν γὰρ ταῦτα τοῖς ποιηταῖς 11-12 τί ἀποκοπή *cf. Arist. Poet. 22 (1458a34-b3)* οὐκ ἐλάχιστον δὲ μέρος συμβάλλεται εἰς τὸ σαφές τῆς λέξεως καὶ μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν αἱ ἐπεκτάσεις καὶ ἀποκοπαὶ καὶ ἐξαλλαγαὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων *in Poet. 21 (1457b2) Aristoteles ἀποκοπήν generaliter ὑφηρημένον appellat, vid. PHamb. 128.79-82 (*33c) et Tryph. De tropis (RhGr 3 p. 198.18)* 13 τίνες αἱ ὑποσύνθετοι καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα *vid. Joannem Philoponum, In Aristot. Categorias Commentarium Proemium (CAG 13.1 pp. 9.34-10.18), Dexippum, In Aristotelis Categorias 1.4 (CAG 4.2 p. 12.3-11) et Simplicium, In Arist. Categorias Commentarium 4 in Arist. 1b25 (CAG 8 pp. 71.22-72.5)* 15-16 *cf. οὐ]δεμίαν ο[ύ]λσίαν] δηλοῦν in PHamb. 128.7-8 (*33a)*

6 Mayer 1910 pp. VI-VII n. 5 *scribendum esse* ἃς ἐν τῷ <περὶ λέξεως> περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων *putavit, sed vid. p. LI (Corrigenda)* “... *qua ex editione (i.e. Kalbfleisch) nunc intellego codices omnes exhibere* περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων” 7 οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν JKA, Stroux 1912 p. 24 et Schenkeveld 1998 p. 70 8 τὰ τοῦ λόγου A

1990 pp. 103-104, Schenkeveld 1990 pp. 103-04, Schenkeveld 1993b p. 79, Schenkeveld 1994a p. 271, Schenkeveld 1998 pp. 69-79, Blank 1996 p. 140, Chase 2003 pp. 25-6, 106-07, Fortenbaugh 2005 pp. 124-26 and 244-50.

² Simplicius' (490 – 560 AD) sources are two books of Porphyry (233/234 – 305 AD). Porphyry explains that the subject of Aristotle's *Categories* has to do with logic (the predicates, i.e. sounds that signify things), and not with expressions (*lexeis*) “as part of a speech” or “as part of a sentence” (we can doubt how to translate here *logos*). The *lexeis*, he informs us, belong to another topic, treated by Theophrastus and his associates (among whom I presume to be Praxiphanes) in a specific work.

³ The title of this work deserves attention: *Peri tōn tou logou stoicheiōn* (Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων) can be translated *On the Elements of the Speech* (or *On the Elements of the Sentence*). Two key-words are here 1. *stoicheia* ‘elements,’ (I assume that in the Aristotelian philosophical system ‘elements’ *stoicheia*, cannot be considered synonym of ‘parts,’ *mēre*) and 2. *logos* (‘speech’ or ‘sentence’ in logical / dialectic sense), to be intended as different from *lexis* (‘expression’ in a rhetorical and poetical sense).

⁴ Some manuscripts propose the reading “and those who have written on these matters,” which seems a worse variant, followed by Stroux 1912 p. 24, Schenkeveld 1998 p. 70, Grube 1952 p. 176. Schenkeveld 1998 p. 70 wrongly says that the reading of the best manuscripts gives an impossible Greek construction. On the contrary, following the text adopted also by Fortenbaugh in FHS&G 683, I find good reasons to think that the participle (*gegraphotes*) has a relative construction and “governs the string of sample questions that follow the participle” (Fortenbaugh 2005 p. 247); therefore the work *On the Elements of the Speech* (or *of the Sentence*) seems to be known as school-work, but quoted according to the name of its master because of his great fame. I suspect that Praxiphanes was, among Theophrastus' pupils and colleagues, one of the most interested in a ‘grammatical’ topic. See **9A-C, 23A-B, 24**.

⁵ It is remarkable that, although the verb and noun are considered ‘parts’ of the *logos*, in the work *On the Elements of the Speech* there arose the question whether nouns and verbs, together with all that is recognized as ‘part’ of the *lexis*, can be considered ‘elements’ of the *logos*. See *Scholium Londinense in Dionysi Thracis Artem Grammaticam* 11 (Hilgard 1901 p. 515.19-29), my paper here and the commentary of Matelli 2012, *ad loc*.

⁶ See **24**.

⁷ About the ‘parts’ and ‘elements’ of the *lexis*, see Arist. *Poet.* 20 (1456b20-21) Dionys. Hal. *On Demosthenes* 48 (= Arist. Tit. 82 nr. 143 Gigon pp. 401-02) *On Thucydides* 22.1-2, *On the Composition of Words* 2.1 (Arist. Tit. 82 nr. 142 Gigon p. 401, Theodectes XXXII 3.5 Baiterus-Sauppe p. 248) and 7.1.

⁸ The work *On the Elements of the Sentence* tries to conciliate logical inquiry on *logos* with the poetic and rhetorical observations about communication, probably preparing the birth of a new discipline, the scientific ‘grammar.’ This is the reason why, I think, we can attribute this work to Praxiphanes (see **9A-C**).

128 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

***33a** *PHamb.* 128 col. 1 (linn. 5-32 pp. 36-37 Snell)

col. 15]. μὲν οὖν.
.....]τ...]. συλλαβῆς
.....]εῖση[ς οὐ]δεμίαν οὐ-
σίαν] δηλοῦν, οἷον Δ[ῶρ]ος·
τούτο]ν γὰρ ἀφαιρεθείσης
10 τῆς πρ[ώτης σ[υλ]λαβῆς κα-
ταλεί]πεται ρ[ο]ς], ὅπερ οὐ[δὲ]ν
τῶν σημαιν[όντ]ω]ν ἐστίν.
.....]ν ὁδετ[.]τουπαν
.....]η..ροει[...]. της
15]ου τῆσδε [τ]ῆς χώρα[ς]
.....]την τελευτήν
.....]συμβέβηκεν
.....].σ τούτου
.....]τουτο[.]ες
20φ]αίρεσις συν
.....]πλειστα
.....]ωριζο-
μεν.....] ἄλλου
.....]λειοι του
25]λοι τήν
.....]ν καὶ τὸν
.....]αττον
.....]τους μη
.....]χοουηε
30]χην φη
.....]α σκηνη
καὶ οἷον καμπτή]ρα νύσσαν.

Hoc fragmentum Theophrasto vindicat editor Theophr. FHS&G 2 p. 612
Appendix 9 col. 1

7-8 οὐ]δεμίαν οὐ[σίαν] δηλοῦν *cf. Plat. Cratyl.* 388c Ὀνομα ἄρα διδασκαλικόν
τί ἐστίν ὄργανον καὶ διακριτικὸν τῆς οὐσίας ὥσπερ κερκὶς ὑφάσματος
388d ἢ οὐσία τοῦ πράγματος δηλουμένη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι *vid. verbi* δηλοῦν
usum in Arist. De interpr. 2 (16a28), 5 (17a16 et 18), 7 (17b8), *Categ.* 5 (2b31
et 3b12) *vid. *32.15-16* καθὸ μέντοι σημαντική ἐστίν ἡ λέξις, κατὰ
τὰ γένη τῶν ὄντων ἀφορίζεται 8-12 *vid. Arist. De interpr.* 2 (16a19-29),

***33a** *PHamb.* 128, col. 1 linn. 5-32 Snell¹

... therefore when a syllable² is removed, indicates no reality³: for example *Dōros*, for when the first syllable of this (word) is taken away, *ros* is left, which is not something that has meaning...⁴

... of this place ... the end... happened... ... this ... (aph)eresis.⁵
Syn(onym) ... we (s)eparate of other...

... (gap of 6 lines) ...

tent, and for example turning post (*skēnos*), winning post (*nyssa*)...⁶

¹ This papyrus is catalogued in *Inv. Hamb. Bibl.* nr. 650 and 650 fr.16, Merkelbach 1956, nr. 1100, pp. 107-08, Pack² nr. 1502 = M-P³ nr. 2289.1, LDAB nr. 4022. Its date: end 3rd cent. BC, the same century as Praxiphanes.

See discussions in Snell 1954 pp. 36-50, Merkelbach 1956 nr. 1100 pp. 107-08, Lucas 1968 pp. 202-205, Bennekom 1975 pp. 399-411, Janko 1984 pp. 51, 180-81, Innes 1985 p. 251-52, Schenkeveld 1993a p. 86, Schenkeveld 1993b, Schenkeveld 1994a pp. 292, 304, Schenkeveld 1994b p. 13, Montanari E. 1999 nr. 103 Theophr. p. 869, Guidorizzi-Beta 2000 pp. 73-75 (translation) et 165-70, Fortenbaugh 2005 pp. 254-66, Chiron 2001 pp. 214-215, Calboli 2007, Dorandi in this volume.

² The papyrus starts with a definition of the noun with respect to the syllable: about this method, see Arist. *De interpr.* 2 (16a19-29), 4 (16b26-17a2); *Poet.* 20 (1456b34-36): “A syllable is a non-significant sound, compounded of a stop (i.e. a sound that is produced when the flow of air inside the mouth is stopped) and of a voiced element (i.e. a vowel): *gr* is a syllable without *a* and with *a* (i.e. *gra*).”

³ I think that the locution *o(usian) dēloun* has a dialectic / semantic meaning that should not be obscured by the translation. The semantic problem of the syllable in respect to the meaning of the word had been opened by Plat. *Cratyl.* 393d, a passage where the locution *ousia dēloumenē* is crucial “Socrates: ... by the same argument any offspring of a king should be called a king; and whether the same meaning is expressed in one set of syllables or another makes no difference; and if a letter is added or subtracted, that does not matter either, so long as the essence of the thing named remains in force and is made plain in the name.” See also Arist. *De interpr.* 2 (16a28), 5 (17a16 et 18), 7 (17b8), *Categ.* 5 (2b31 and 3b12).

⁴ About these lines, see Snell 1954 p. 40, Schenkeveld 1993b p. 68, Fortenbaugh 2005 pp. 255-56. Cf. Arist. *Poet* 20 (1457a10-14): “the noun is a compound sound, non-temporal, significant, no part of which is independently significant: for in double nouns we do not employ any part as independently

4 (16b26-17a2), *Poet. 20* (1456b34-36) συλλαβὴ δέ ἐστιν φωνὴ ἄσημος συνθετὴ ἐξ ἀφώνου καὶ φωνὴν ἔχοντος, *Poet. 20* (1457a10-14) ὄνομα δέ ἐστι φωνὴ συνθετὴ σημαντικὴ ἄνευ χρόνου, ἥς μέρος οὐδέν ἐστι καθ' αὐτὸ σημαντικόν· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς διπλοῖς οὐ χρώμεθα ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ σημαῖνον, οἷον ἐν τῷ Θεόδωρος τὸ δωρος οὐ σημαίνει 15-16 *agitur fortasse de diversis exitibus* ἐν γλώτταις *et* ἐν κύριοις ὀνόμασιν *iuxta Snell p. 41 Arist. Poet. 21* (1457b3-6) γλῶτται *et* κύρια ὀνόματα *describit* 20-21 *agitur fortasse de synonymis* (Snell p. 41) 22-23 *si* χωρίζομεν, *vid.* κεχωρισμένον *in Arist. De interpr. 2* (16a20 *et* 25-26) *et* 4 (16b27) 31 *cf. Sudam* Σ 573 s.v. Σκῆνος *et K 1811* s.v. Κλισία 32 νύσσα *pro* καμπτήρ *in Schol. Od. 23.332 et Suda* Ν 617 s.v. Νύσσα

5-8 φαίνεται μὲν οὖν τὸ σύνθετον μιᾶς συλλαβῆς ληφθείσης οὐδεμίαν οὐσίαν δηλοῦν *Fleischer ap. Snell* : ἐστὶ μὲν οὖν σύνθετον τὸ μιᾶς συλλαβῆς ἀφαιρεθείσης οὐδεμίαν οὐσίαν δηλοῦν *Snell* 13 γοδ *vel* ησδ, *fortasse* δὲ τι τοῦ παντός *Snell* 20 ἀφ[αί]ρεσις *vel* ὑφ[αί]ρεσις συν (*sed* ν *vix legitur*) *vel* κυρι 20-21 συν[ωνυμία *vel* συν[ώνυμον *suspiciatur Snell p. 41* 22-23 γν[ωρί]ζομεν *vel* χ[ωρί]ζομεν 25 πολλοὶ *vel* ἄλλοι 27 ἔλ[αττον] 31 -νη *vel* -νην *vel* -νος *legenda sunt iuxta Snell, qui p. 41 prop.* φη[σιν] καὶ οἷον σῶμ[α] σκῆνος *vel* φη[μι] οἷον σκῆνωμ[α] σκῆνος *vel similia*

***33b** *PHamb.* 128 col. 2 (linn. 33-64 pp. 37-38 Snell)

col. 2.1 = (233 Snell) .[.]ελ..[.]..[.] οἱ[

τεδεπενιου [.....]...

- 35 δηλοῦν, οἷον· κλάδος, ἔρνος
βλαστός, καὶ οἷον· μέλαν
δνοφερὸν ἐρεμνόν. με-
ταφορὰν δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν ὀ-
νομάτων ἢ ῥημάτων συν-
40 θέτων ἀπὸ ὁμοίου τινὸς
ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα μετενη-
γεγμένων, οἷον· τὸ γῆρας
δυσμᾶς βίου, καὶ τὴν ἔρη-
μον νῆσον χηρεύειν ἀνδρῶν,
45 καὶ τὸμ βασιλέα ποιμένα
λαῶν. ἐπίθετον δὲ τὸ
μετὰ κυρίων ὀνομάτων λε-
γόμενον, οἷον· σίδηρος αἵ-
θων, καὶ χρυσὸς αἰγλήεις.

significant: e.g. in ‘Theodōrus’ ‘-dorus’ has no meaning.” The semantic problem of the parts which compound a simple or a double name is old, and inspired poets influenced by the Sophists. See e.g. in Aesch. *Agam.* 688-90 the tragic allusions built through the connection of Helen’s name with other terms starting with the syllable *hel-* (*helenaus*: ship-destroying; *helandros*: man-destroying; *heleptolis* city-destroying) and in Eur. *Helen* 12-14 the interpretation of Theonoe’ name as ‘the purpose of God’. Plato approaches the semantic problem of words in the linguistic inquiries of *Cratylus*.

⁵ Lines 12-20 present severe gaps: Snell p. 41 suspects that here were treated standard terms (*kyria onomata*) and loan terms (*glōssai*). See *Poet.* 21 (1457b3-6): “By standard term (*kyrion*) I mean one used by a community, by ‘loan word’ (*glōtta*) one used by outsiders: obviously, then, the same word can be both a loan word and a standard term. Though not for the same groups: *sigynon* (‘spear’) is standard for Cypriots, a loan word for us.”

⁶ Lines 20-32 present even more severe gaps than the previous lines. Snell p. 41 proposes to fill the gap reading *syn(ōnymon)* or *syn(ōnymia)* in lines 20-21 and therefore on the basis of the following examples, he suspects that here *synonymy* is treated in relationship with standard terms (*kyria*) and loan words (*glōttai*).

***33b** *PHamb.* 128 (col. 2) linn. 33-64 (Snell pp. 37-38)

... (showing the same meaning), e.g. ‘twig,’ ‘sprout,’ ‘shoot,’ and e.g. ‘black,’ ‘murky,’ ‘dark.’¹

(Men call) metaphor the transfer of unchanged substantival or verbal composite expressions from something similar to another thing,² e.g., old age is ‘the setting of life’³ and the desolate island ‘is bereft of men’⁴ and the king (is) ‘shepherd of the people.’⁵

132 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- 50 γίνεται δὲ καὶ διπλοῦν
καὶ τριπλοῦν καὶ κατὰ τὸ
μὴ συμβεβηκό[ς], ὃ δὴ στέρη-
σίν τινες καλοῦσιν, οἷ-
ον τὸν σακεσφόρον, ἀρηΐφιλον·
- 55 τὸ δὲ τριπλοῦν· [βο]τρυο-
καρποτόκον καὶ ἀστερομαρ-
μαροφεγγές, τὸ δὲ μὴ κα-
τὰ τὸ συμβεβηκός ἄπ[λ]ουν,
ἄπτερον. μετουσίαν δ' ἐ-
- 60 κ τοῦ παρεπομένου διτ-
ταχῶς ἐγλαμβάνουσιν,
ἐνίστε μὲν [ἀπ'] εἶδους ἐπὶ
- 63a γένος, <ἐνίστε δ' ἀπὸ γένους ἐπὶ
- 63b εἶδος>· οἷον ἀπὸ γένους
μὲν ἐπ' εἶδ[ος,] ὅταν τ[.]ν

*Hoc fragmentum Theophrasto vindicat editor Theophr. FHS&G 2 pp. 612-14
Appendix 9 col. 2.33-64 de metaphoris in linn. 37-64 vid. T30 Guidorizzi-
Beta 2000 pp. 72-4*

33-37 *de synonymis fortasse agitur, de quibus Arist. Categ. 1 (1a6-10)*
συνώνυμα δὲ λέγεται ὧν τό τε ὄνομα κοινὸν καὶ ὁ κατὰ τοῦνομα
λόγος τῆς οὐσίας ὁ αὐτός, οἷον ζῶον ὃ τε ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ βοῦς.
τούτων γὰρ ἑκάτερον κοινῶ ὀνόματι προσαγορεύεται ζῶον, καὶ ὁ λόγος
δὲ τῆς οὐσίας ὁ αὐτός *synonyma in Arist. Rhet. 3.2 (1404b39-1405a10)*
tractantur, desunt in Poetica 35-36 cf. Theophr. Hist. Plant. 1.1.9 κλάδον δὲ
τὸ βλάστημα τὸ ἐκ τούτων ἐφ' ἓν, οἷον μάλιστα τὸ ἐπέτειον, *Hesych.*
Lexicon ε 66 (*Latte 1966 p. 197*) ἔρνη· κέρατα. ἢ *βλαστήματα *Av*, 68 (*Latte*
1966 p. 197) ἔρνος· *κλάδος. στέλεχος *Avgn* δένδρον εὐθαλές. *βλάστημα
Avgn φυτόν (*P* 53), 69 (*Latte 1966 p. 197*) ἔρρυγας (ἔρρυτας *cod. H*
: *emendavit Pearson, collato Arist. Poet. 21.1457b35*)· ἔρνη, βλαστήματα,
κλάδοι 36-37 *cf. Schol. Il. 9.15 et 16.4* δνοφερόν· μέλαν 37-46 *de*
translatione per proportionem vel analogiam agitur, cf. Aristotelis quattuor
translationum formas: 1. ex genere ad speciem 2. ex specie ad genus 3. ex
specie ad speciem 4. per proportionem vel analogiam in Poet. 21 (1457b6-9)
μεταφορὰ δέ ἐστίν ὀνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορὰ ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐπὶ
εἶδος ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶδους ἐπὶ τὸ γένος ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶδους ἐπὶ εἶδος ἢ κατὰ
τὸ ἀνάλογον ... *translatio ex specie ad speciem et translatio per proportionem*
proximae sunt, cf. Poet. 21 (1457b13-25) de translatione per analogiam vid.
etiam Arist. Rhet. 3.10 (1410b13-15) translatio ap. Theophrastum in FHS&G
*683 (= *32.11), 689A, 689B, 690 42-43 τὸ γῆρας δυσμὰς βίου Arist. Poet.*

(Men call) an epithet that which is used in conjunction with ordinary words,⁶ e.g. ‘blazing’ iron and ‘dazzling’ gold. There is also the double and triple (epithet) and (one) in respect to what does not apply, which some call privation,⁷ e.g. (double): ‘shield-bearing,’⁸ ‘Ares-loving;’⁹ triple (epithet): ‘grape-fruit-producing’ and ‘star-crystal-bright;’¹⁰ and that in respect to which something does not apply: ‘footless,’ ‘wingless.’¹¹

People classify *metousia* from what follows in two ways: sometimes (from genus to species and sometimes) from species to genus, e.g. from genus to species, when¹²

¹ Lines 33-37: the started discourse about synonyms in standard and loan speeches seems to go on also at the beginning of the new column, where we read two series of examples: in each one a standard term is drawn beside two loan terms.

² Lines 37-46 deal with another kind of analogy than synonymy: metaphor, defined as the transference of names and verbs from their own content to new similar matters. Metaphor works by analogy, as demonstrated by the definition and by the examples of old age as ‘life’s sunset,’ of a desert island as ‘bereft (widowed) of men,’ and of a king as ‘people’s shepherd’. Aristotle treated metaphor differently in *Poet.* 21 (1457b6-9): “a metaphor is the application (*epiphora*) of a word that belongs to another thing, either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy.” The author of *PHamb.* 128 treats these four distinctions differently: here only the transference of words from species to species and by analogy seems to have to do with metaphor, while the transference from genus to species and from species to genus is treated under *metousia* (see the following lines 59-63b). See Snell 1954 pp. 43-64, Schenkeveld 1993b p. 69, 71-80, Calboli 2007 pp. 137-41.

³ See Arist. *Poet.* 21 (1457b 23-25) = Empedocles 31 DK B152.

⁴ vid. *Od.* 9.124.

⁵ vid. Tryph. *De tropis* 2.4.3 West p. 237.

⁶ Lines 46-59: the new subject is *epithet*, the ornamental term connected to the standard term designating a person or a thing and that, by Aristotle, has the aim of praising or blaming: it is given by analogy and is strictly connected with metaphor. Aristotle deals with epithets indirectly in *Poet.* 21 (1457b 1-3: in this passage epithets have to be recognized under the idea of *kosmos*, ‘ornament’, as recognized by Schenkeveld 1993b p. 71) and directly in *Rhet.* 3.2 (1405a10-11 and 1405b21-28), 3.3 (1406a10-35), 3.6 (1407b31-32), 3.7 (1408b10-13).

21 (1457b 23-25) = *Empedocles* 31 DK B152 ἐρεῖ τοίνυν τὴν ἐσπέραν γῆρας ἡμέρας ἢ ὥσπερ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, καὶ τὸ γῆρας ἐσπέραν βίου ἢ δυσμάς βίου (cf. *Plat. Leg.* 770a ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν δυσμαῖς τοῦ βίου) 43-44 ἀνδρῶν χηρεύει cf. *Od.* 9.124, cf. *Aelian. De natura animalium* 4.59 (*Hercher pp.* 107.17-20) 45-46 τὸμ βασιλέα ποιμένα λαῶν *de translatione ab animalibus in animalia per analogiam agitur, vid. Tryph. De tropis* 2.4.3 (*West p.* 237) *Arist. Rhet.* 3.11 (1411b25-32) *vividam translationem appellat eam quae ab animalibus in inanimalia pergit et invicem, cf. Demetr. De elocutione* 81 46-59 *de epitheto* cf. *Arist. Poet.* 21 (1457b 1-3), *Rhet.* 3.2 (1405a 10-11 et 1405b21-28), 3.3 (1406a10-35) *epitheta una cum translatione inter sermonis ornamenta tractata sunt in Arist. Rhet.* 3.6 (1407b31-32) καὶ μεταφορᾷ δηλοῦν καὶ τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις, εὐλαβούμενον τὸ ποιητικόν, *Rhet.* 3.7 (1408b10-13) τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα τὰ διπλᾶ καὶ [τὰ] ἐπίθετα πλείω καὶ τὰ ξένα μάλιστα ἀρμόττει λέγοντι παθητικῶς 48-49 σίδηρος αἶθων cf. *Il.* 4.485 49 χρυσὸς αἰγλήεις cf. *Pind. Pyth.* 4.231, *PMG Fragmenta adespota* 9 nr. 927 50-59 *de vocabulis simplicibus vel compositis* cf. *Arist. Poet.* 21 (1457a31-b1) 52-53, 57-59 *de epithetis privationis* cf. *Arist. Rhet.* 3.6 (1408a 4-9) et *Arist. Metaph.* 4.22 (1022b 32-36) στερητικὰ ὀνόματα *tractavit Chrysippus secutus Aristotelem, iuxta Simplicium, cuius fons Jamblichus: vid. Simpl. in Arist. Categorias Commentarium* 10 (*in Arist.* 12a26) = *Chrys. fr.* 179 SVF 2 p. 52 καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸν Χρύσιππον Ἀριστοτέλει ἐπόμενον στερητικὰ λέγειν ταῦτα, ὅσα ἀναιρεῖ παρεμφαίνοντα τὴν τοῦ ἔχειν φύσιν, οὐχ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐμφαίνῃ τὸ πεφυκὸς καὶ ὅτε πέφυκεν, ὡς εἴρηται πρότερον (*vide etiam fr.* 933-40 FDS 3 pp. 1184-1196) ἐπιθετικὸν κατὰ στέρησιν *tractavit Joannes Philoponus, De vocabulis quae diversum significatum exhibent secundum differentiam accentus, Recensio B* α 8.2 (*Daly p.* 56) ἀνακές· ὅτε ἐπιθετικὸν κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ ἄκουσ ὀξύνεται 54 τὸν σακεσφόρον cf. *Eurip. Phoen.* 139, *Soph. Ajax* 19 ἀρηΐφιλον *verbum epicum et lyricum: vid., e.g., Il.* 2.778, 3.21, 3.52, 3.69, 3.90, *Pind. Isthmia* 8.25 55-57 βοτρυοκαρποτόκος et ἀστερομαρμαροφεγγής *alibi non inveniuntur, sed vide μαρμαροφεγγής in Timoth. Pers.* 92-93 (μαρμαροφεγγεῖς παῖδες) et ἀστεροφεγγής *in Orphic. Hymn.* 3.3 et 5.5, *PMG Fragmenta adespota* 9 nr. 927 59-63b *de μετουσία* cf. *Schol. in Iliadem* 22.441b (*Erbse* 5 pp. 347.35-36) θρόνα· τὰ βαπτὰ ἔρια, κατὰ μετουσίαν, ὁμοίως τοῖς ποιούσι τὰ ποιούμενα, *Schol. in Pind. Nem.* 5 85c (*Drachmann p.* 112.19-20) ἢ ζάκοτόν φησι κατὰ μετουσίαν τοῦ φέροντος καὶ αὐτὸ συμπνέον τῇ ὀργῇ, ἀπὸ τῶν παρ' Ὀμήρῳ, *Anonym. De Tropis* 3 s.v. Κατάχρησις (*RhGr* 3 p. 208.20-24) Κατάχρησις ἐστὶ φράσις μετενεχθεῖσα ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτως κατονομασθέντος κυρίως, ὡς εἴ τις λέγει πυξίδα τὴν ἐκ χαλκοῦ κατεσκευασμένην· μόνη γὰρ κυρίως ἢ ἐξ πύξου μετουσιαστικῶς πύξις ὀνομάζεται. κτλ. *Metousiam Aristoteles non nominat, sed eadem videtur esse ac translatio ex genere ad speciem, vel ex specie ad genus: vid. Poet.* 21 (1457b6-13) *De metousia* vid. etiam *Phot. Biblioth. cod.* 213, pp. 171b2-7 *Bekker* (= *Henry* 3 p. 124) ποιεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ τοῦτο μάλιστα οὐχὶ ἢ τῶν

⁷ Lines 50-59 propose a partition of epithet, which is new in respect to Aristotle, but applying the same method just used for any kind of compound words (nouns, verbs, adjectives) in *Poet.* 21 (1457a31-b1) and *Rhet.* 3.6 (1408a 4-9), *Metaph.* 4.22 (1022b32-36). In fact we read in the papyrus about double and triple epithets and that ‘in respect to what does not apply.’ See Schenkeveld 1993b pp. 69-70.

⁸ Eurip. *Phoen.* 139, Soph. *Ajax* 19.

⁹ This is a very common epic and lyric epithet; see e.g. *Il.* 2.778, 3.21, 3.52, 3.69, 3.90, Pind. *Isthmian* 8.25.

¹⁰ These triple epithets have not been found in other texts.

¹¹ These two epithets ‘in respect to what does not apply’ are very common in Greek literature.

¹² *Metousia* is treated in lines 59-64. It achieves its effects through association of one object with another connected either by genus to species or species to genus, while in lines 37-46 metaphor is described as the transference of names and verbs from their own meaning to new similar matters by analogy. With respect to Aristotle’s theory, which gathered together under the same idea four kinds of metaphors (including the one by analogy and the one from species to species, called here *metousia*), this one shows a more specialized perspective, which certainly contributes to the theory on metonymy and synecdoche expressed in the *Rhetoric to Herennius* 4.43-45. Here metonymy is described as “the figure that draws from an object closely akin or associated an expression suggesting the object meant, but not called by its own name. This is accomplished by substituting the name of the greater thing by that of the lesser ... or by substituting the name of the thing invented for that of the inventor ... or the instrument for the possessor ... the cause for the effect ... or effect for cause.... content designated by means of container ... container designated by means of content ... etc.” *Synecdochē* is said to occur “when the whole is known from a small part or a part from the whole,” for instance when the entire marriage ceremony is suggested by one sign: the flutes. On *synecdochē*, see Neumann 1998.

λέξεων αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν μεταβολή, ἀλλ' ἢ ἀπὸ πραγμάτων ἑτέρων εἰς ἕτερα μετὰ τινος σοφῆς καὶ ἡρεμαίας μεταχειρίσεως μετάβασίς τε καὶ μετατροπή

35 δηλοῦν *vel* ἀπλοῦν *non* διπλοῦν *cf. col. 1.8* 38-39 <τὸ> τῶν αὐτῶν
ὀνομάτων *vel melius* <τὸ> τῶν ὀνομάτων αὐτῶν *dubitanter Snell in adnotatione*
p. 42 39-40 συνθέτων *quid velit non liquet* 37-42 μεταφορὰν δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν
ὀνομάτων ἢ ῥημάτων ... ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα μετενηγεγμένων *Snell in adn. p.*
42 et Schenkeveld 1993b, pp. 75-76 : μεταφορὰν δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν ὀνομάτων ἢ
ῥημάτων ... ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα μετενηγεγμένον *Snell in textu* : μεταφορὰν
δὲ <ἐκ> ... μετενηγεγμένων, *vel* <τὸ ἐκ> ... μετενηγεγμένον, *vel* <τὸ ἐκ>
... σύνθετον ... μετενηγεγμένον *prop. Schenkeveld 1993b p. 76 et n. 35* 58
corr. Snell 63a-63b <ἐνίοτε δ' ἀπὸ γένους ἐπὶ εἶδος> *Snell, vid. adn. p.*
44 64-65 ὅταν τ[ῆ]ν [γ]ῆν μητ[έ]ρα θηρῶν (*vel* πάντων) προσ[τ]αγορεύωσιν
dubitanter Snell in adnotatione, qui etiam ὅταν [Ἰ]δ[η]ν μητ[έ]ρα θηρῶν *susp. ex*
Il. 8.47 Ἰδ[η]ν δ' ἴκανε πολυπίδακα μητέρα θηρῶν

***33c** *PHamb.* 128 col. 3 (linn. 65-96 pp. 38-39 Snell)

col. 3.1 = (3.65 Snell).] ην μητ[προσ-
α]γορεύωσιν, [ἀπ' εἶδους
δ' ἐπὶ γένος, [ὅταν τοὺς ὑ-
ποκριτὰς κ[
δους τε κ[ὄνο-
70 μάζωσιν[πεποιημέ-
νον δὲ τὸ π[λε-
γόμενον μ.[
παν μηδε[
τισα..[
75 τινος[
οιον [.].[
γὰρ κα[
ριωθεν[
ριν. ἀφ[ηρημένον δὲ τὸ
80 συλλαβαῖς.τ. [
οῖον ἀντὶ τοῦ [δῶμά φασιν
δῶ, καὶ ἀντ[ὶ τοῦ κριθῇ κρῖ.
ἐπεκτετα[μένον δὲ τὸ
].[
85 μ[οῖον ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἀχιλλεῖος

***33c** *PHamb.* 128 (col. 3) linn. 65-96

People call it from species to genus, when the actors...¹
 ... people apply the name ... neologism²... (People call) contracted
 that which by syllables e.g. instead of *doma* (house) men say
do, and instead of *krithē* (*barley*), *kri*.³ (People call) lengthened
 e.g. instead of *Achilleios*, *Achillēios*.⁴ (People call)
 syncopated a shortened word ... e.g. *thygatrōn* ‘of daughters’
 instead *thygaterōn*.⁵ (People call) altered that which departs
 slightly from what is normal, e.g. *libanos* instead of *libanōtos*,
 and instead of ...

¹ Column 3.65-69 goes on about the same topic as the last lines of column 2, but a gap deprives us of an important example that illustrates *metousia*. A reconstruction can only be supposed. I suspect here the possibility of an example of *metousia* coinciding with a *katachrēsis*, i.e. a word is used in a figurative sense to remedy an absence in the lexicon. See Arist. *Poet.* 21 (1457b25-33). Schenkeveld 1993b p. 78 thinks that the papyrus has no trace of *katachrēsis*, but I suppose that we can recognize at least an example (even if not a theory) from genus to species, if we accept the words added by Snell in col. 3.68-69 (actors called ‘comic-players’ from the action of playing comedies or ‘mime artists’ from the action of miming).

² Here and in the following lines, the classification of different kinds of words continues: we have read about *standard term*, *loan word*, *synonymy*, *metaphor*, *epithet* and *metousia*: now we are going to read about *neologism*,

Ἀχιλλ[ή]ιος. [συγκεκομμέ-
 νον δὲ τὸ[
 ἐλαττον[οἶον
 ἀντὶ τοῦ. [
 90 τομος, καὶ [ἀντὶ τοῦ θυ-
 γατέρων θυγ[ατρῶν. ἐ-
 ξηλλαγμένον [δὲ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ
 νομιζομένου πα[
 μικρὸ]ν ἡλλοιωμένον[οἶ-
 95 ον ἀντὶ τοῦ λιβανω[τὸς
 λίβανος, καὶ ἀντὶ [τοῦ

*Hoc fragmentum Theophrasto vindicat editor Theophr. FHS&G 2 pp. 614-16
 Appendix 9 col. 3*

66-70 *si de catachresi loquitur cf. Arist. Poet. 21 (1457b25-33)* ἐνίοις δ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὄνομα κείμενον τῶν ἀνάλογον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἦττον ὁμοίως λεχθήσεται· οἶον τὸ τὸν καρπὸν μὲν ἀφιέναι σπείρειν, τὸ δὲ τὴν φλόγα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνώνυμον· ἀλλ' ὁμοίως ἔχει τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὸ σπείρειν πρὸς τὸν καρπὸν, διὸ εἴρηται “σπείρων θεοκτίσταν φλόγα”. ἔστι δὲ τῷ τρόπῳ τούτῳ τῆς μεταφορᾶς χρῆσθαι καὶ ἄλλως, προσαγορεύσαντα τὸ ἀλλότριον ἀποφῆσαι τῶν οἰκείων τι, οἶον εἰ τὴν ἀσπίδα εἴποι φιάλην μὴ Ἄρεως ἀλλ' ἄοινον 70-96 *de verborum formis et qualitatibus cf. Arist. Poet 21 (1457b1-3)* ἅπαν δὲ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἢ κύριον ἢ γλῶττα ἢ μεταφορὰ ἢ κόσμος ἢ πεποιημένον ἢ ἐπεκτεταμένον ἢ ὑψηλημένον ἢ ἐξηλλαγμένον *et 21 (1457b 33-1458a17), vid. etiam *32.10-13 86 cf. Soph. F 152.3 TrGF 4 p. 168, Her. Hist. 4.56, 4.76, 5.94 91-96 cfr. Arist. Poet. 21 (1458a5-7)* ἐξηλλαγμένον δ' ἐστὶν ὅταν τοῦ ὀνομαζομένου τὸ μὲν καταλείπη τὸ δὲ ποιῇ, οἶον τὸ δεξιτερόν κατὰ μαζόν ἀντὶ τοῦ δεξιόν.

65]ην *vel*]σις,]εις,]ση 69 τεκ[*vel* τεη[68-70 [ὅταν τοὺς ὑ]ποκριτὰς κ[ωμωιδοὺς ἀπ' εἴ]δους τῆς [κωμωιδίας ὀνο]μάζωσιν [τινες *vel* [ὅταν τοὺς ὑ]ποκριτὰς κ[αλοῦντες ἀπ' εἴ]δους τῆς [μιμήσεως ὀνο]μάζωσι μίμους *Snell 77-78 an ἀγ]ριωθεν]?*

lengthening, contraction, modification. About this last topic we find parallel passages in Arist. *Poet.* 21 (1457b1-3) and *32.12-13. About *neologism*, Aristotle writes: “A neologism is a term without existing usage but coined by the poet himself. Some words seem to be of this kind, e.g. *ernyges* for *kerata* (‘horns’) and *arētēr* for *hiereus* (‘priest’)” *Poet.* 21 (1457b33-35).

³ Arist. *Poet.* 21 (1458a2-5) writes “*contraction* has had some parts removed,” and gives the same examples as our papyrus: instead of *doma* (house) *do*, and instead of *krithē* (barley) *kri*.

⁴ Arist. *Poet.* 21 (1458a1-2) “a lengthening uses a longer vowel than the standard form, or an extra syllable.” Achillēios, among others, in Soph. F 152.3 *TrGF* 4 p. 168 and in Her. *Hist.* 4.56, 4.76, 5.94.

⁵ Snell gives the reading *synkekommenon*, i.e. syncopated. *Syncopē* is generally defined as the contraction of a word by omission of middle sounds. It is related to *contraction*. The *syncopē* ‘*thygatrōn*’ is very common.

INDEX OF SOURCES FOR PRAXIPHANES

APOLLODORUS MYTHOGRAPHUS (1 AD?) <i>ap. Diogenem Laertium, Vitae philosophorum</i> 10.13 Marcovich p. 718.10-12	6	DIOGENES LAERTIUS (2 BC) <i>Vitae philosophorum</i> 3.8 (Marcovich p. 197.4-7) 18 nr. 3, 21 n., 22, 26 n. 3.109 (Marcovich p. 255.2-6) 8 10.13 (Marcovich p. 718.10-12) see APOLLODORUS
ARISTOTELIS VITA see HESYCHIUS, <i>Vita Aristotelis</i>		
BULLAE CERAMICAE ALEXANDRIAE (Alexandrinae quae dicitur aetatis) nr. 157a-b (Neroutsos p. 242)	*1E, *17A-B	EPIPHANIUS (obiit 403 AD) <i>De fide</i> 9.35-39 (Holl-Dummer p. 508.4-15) 1B, 3A n., 3B, 5, 18 nr. 11, 19
CALLIMACHUS (3 BC) <i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i> fr. 460 (<i>ap. Vitam Graecam Arati</i>) Pfeiffer 1 p. 351 7 n., 10 n., 11 fr. 460 (<i>ap. Vitam latinam Arati</i>) Pfeiffer 1 p. 352 1A, 7		HESYCHIUS (5 AD) <i>Lexicon</i> δ 1398 (Latte p. 444) 18 nr. 6, 31 <i>Vita Aristotelis</i> 9 (Dorandi p. 98.19-21) 3A n., 3C
CARNEISCUS (4/3 BC) <i>Philistas</i> fr. 95 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1027 Capasso p. 292) 20a 2.1 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1027 coll. 2, 5, 6, 10 Capasso pp. 187-8 9) 20b 2.2 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1027 coll. 13-14 Capasso pp. 190-91) 12 nr. 1a, 20c 2.3 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1027 coll. 15-18.3 Capasso pp. 191-92) 12 nr. 1b, 20d 2.4 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1027 coll. 18.3-21 Capasso pp. 192-95) 12 nr. 1c, 18 nr. 4, 20e		INSCRIPTIONES <i>IG</i> 7. 1752.6-7 (3 BC) (Dittenberg pp. 306-307) *1F, *15 app. 28A 11.4 nr. 613 (3rd BC) (pp. 20-21 Roussel) 1D, 14, *16 n., 28A n. 12 <i>Suppl.</i> 127.13-17 (3 BC) (Hodot pp. 60-65) 1A and n., *1G, 10 n., *16
CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (2/3 AD) <i>Stromata</i> 1.16.79.3 (Stählin-Früchtel-Treu p. 51.17-22) 1C, 9A, *32 n.		LEXICON e codice Coisliniano Graeco 345, s.v. "Αζα (Versio codicis B, α 416, p. 556 Cunningham) 18 nr. 6, 30A ¹
DEMETRIUS (Alexandrinae quae dicitur aetatis) <i>De elocutione</i> 55-58 (Chiron pp. 20-21) 18 nr. 5, 24, app. *32 and n.		MARCELLINUS (4 AD) <i>Vita Thucydidis</i> 28-30 (Piccirilli p. 24.137-148) 18 nr. 1, 21

PAPYRI

PDuke (4 AD)

inv. G 178 col. 2.17-22

(T1 Willis-Dorandi pp. 81-82) **1B**,
3A, **3B** n., **19** n.

PHamb. (3 BC)

128, col. 1 linn. 5-32 (Snell

pp. 36-37) **24** n., app. ***32**, ***33a**

col. 2 linn. 33-64 (Snell

pp. 37-38) **24** n., app. **29A**,
app. ***32**, ***33b**

col. 3 linn. 65-96 (Snell

pp. 38-39) **24** n., app.
***32**, ***33c**

PHerc. 1027 see CARNEISCUS, *Philistas*

PHerc. 1425 see PHILODEMUS,

PHerc. 1538 *De poematibus*

POxy.

8.1086.11-18 (1 BC)

(nr. 6 Matelli p. 60) **12** nr. 3, **12** nr. 3,
18 nr. 7, **25**, **28A** n.

17.2079 (2 AD) see CALLIMACHUS,
Aetia I, fr. 1

65.4457, fr. 2 (3 AD)

(Haslam p. 63) **12** nr. 2, **26**

PSI 11.1219 fr. 1 (2 AD) see SCHOLIA
FLORENTINA ad
Callimachi Aetia 1

PHILODEMUS GADARENSIS (1 BC)

De poematibus 5.2

PHerc. 1425 col. 12.10-35

(Mangoni pp. 139-140) **6** n., **18** nr. 2,
18 nr. *3n., **26** n., **27**

PHOTIUS (9 AD)

Lexicon,

A 428.2 (Theodoridis p. 50) **18** nr. 6, **30A**²

PORPHYRIUS (3 AD)

Testimonia et Fragmenta

ap. Simplic. *In Aristotelis*

Categorias, Prooemium

(CAG 8 pp. 10.19-11.2) ***4D**, **18** nr. 5,
24 n., ***32**, app. ***33a**,
app. ***33b**, app. ***33c**

In Timaeum, fr. I (Sodano

pp. 1.1-2.11) ap. Procli

In Platonis Timaeum

Commentaria I (17a) 5 c **12** nr. 5, **18** nr.
10, **23b**, ***32** n.

PROCLUS (5 AD)

Commentaria in Hesiodi Opera et Dies

Prolegomena Ac

(Pertusi p. 2.7-20) **4B**, ***15** n., **18** nr.
10, **28A**, ***32** n.

In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria

I (17a) 5 c (p. 14.20-28

Diehl) = 18 nr. 17 FHS&G **4A**, **12**
nrs. 4-5, **18** nr. *8, **23A**

I (17a) 5 c (pp. 14.28-15.22

Diehl) see PORPHYRIUS,
In Timaeum, fr. I

SCHOLIA

in Callimachi Aetia I vv. 1-12

PSI 11.1219 fr. 1 **1A**, **10**

Cf. CALLIM. *Aetia* I,

fr. 1 in Index of

Parallel Passages

in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum

900 (De Marco

p. 43.15-19) **18** nr. 9, **29A**,

in Theocritum

5.109b (Wendel p. 178.17-18) **18**
nr. 6, ***30B**

Scholium Londinense

in Dionysii Thracis Artem

Grammaticam 1

(Hilgard p. 448.12-16) app. **9A** and
n., **9C**, ***32** n.

Scholium Vaticanum

in Dionysii Thracis Artem

Grammaticam

1 (Hilgard p. 164.23-29) **1C**, **9A** n.,
9B, **10** n., ***32** n.

SIMPLICIUS (6 AD)

In Aristotelis Categorias, Prooemium

(CAG 8 pp. 10.19-11.2) see PORPHYRIUS,
ap. Simplic. *In Arist. Categorias*

142 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

STRABO (1 BC / 1 AD) <i>Geographica</i> 14.2.13 (Radt p. 62.17-64.29)	(app. Pertusi p. 1)	4C, *15 n., 18 nr. 8
SUDA (10 AD) B 324, s.v. βλαύτη Σ 927 s. v. σπεύδειν	18 nr. 9, *29B, app. *29C 18 nr. 9, *29C	VITA GRAECA ARATI Vita 1 (olim sub auctore Achille Tatio) see CALLIMACHUS, Testimonia et Fragmenta
THEOGNOSTUS (9 AD) <i>Canones sive De orthographia</i> (nr. 569 Cramer p. 97.6-12)		VITA ARATI LATINA see CALLIMACHUS, Testimonia et Fragmenta
TZETZES (12 AD) <i>In Hesiodi Opera et Dies</i> <i>Commentarium</i> , Proleg. Ac 7-14	[ZONARAS] <i>Lexicon</i> O s.v. Οἰδίπους (Tittmann col. 1429.27)	2B

INDEX OF PARALLEL PASSAGES QUOTED IN THE APPARATUS OR IN THE NOTES TO THE TRANSLATIONS

<p>AELIANUS (2-3 AD) <i>De natura animalium</i> 4.59 (Hercher pp. 107.17-20) app. *33b</p> <p>AESCHYLUS (6-5 BC) <i>Agamemnon</i> 688-90 *33a n.</p> <p>AMMONIUS (5 AD) <i>In Arist. De Interpretatione</i> 4 17a1.6 (CAG 4.5 pp. 65.31-66.10) app. *32</p> <p>ANDROTION Atheniensis (5-4 BC) 324 fr. 57 <i>FGrHist</i> app. 21</p> <p>ANONYMUS <i>De Tropis</i> 3 s.v. Κατάχρησις (<i>RhGr</i> 3 p. 208.20-24) app. *33b</p> <p>ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA (= AP) <i>AP</i> 9.507 = Callimachus, <i>Epigramma</i> 27 Pfeiffer 2 p. 88 app. 11</p> <p>APOLLODORUS ATHENIENSIS (2 BC) fr. 75 Jacoby p. 354 (= 244 fr. 41 <i>FGrHist</i>) app. 6</p> <p>APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS (2 AD) <i>De coniunctionibus</i> Schneider p. 247.23-25 app. 24 pp. 247.22-258.17 app. 24 p. 248.12-13 24 p. 248.14-249.20 app. 24</p> <p>APOLLONIUS MOLO (2-1 BC) 728 T 1a <i>FGrHist</i>, <i>LGGA</i> s.v. Apollonius [11] Molo app. 13</p> <p>APOLLONIUS SOPHISTA (1/2 AD) <i>Lexicon Homericum</i> s.v. ἄζετο (Bekker p. 11.19-21) app. 30A¹</p> <p>ARATUS SOLEUS (4-3 BC) Ἡθοπολίαι nr. 106 (app.) et 107 <i>Suppl.</i> <i>Hell.</i> p. 39 app. 27</p> <p>ARISTARCHUS (3-2 BC) fr. 5 Waeschke app. 28A</p> <p>ARISTO CEUS (3 BC) fr. 7 Wehrli = nr. 4A SFOD 2006 app. 3C</p>	<p>ARISTOPHANES (5-4 BC) <i>Equites</i> 888-89 app. 29A</p> <p>ARISTOPHANES BYZANTII (3-2 BC) T1 Slater p. 1.4 app. 26</p> <p>ARIST(OTELES) (384-322 BC) <i>Categoriae</i> 1 (1a6-10) app. *33b <i>Categoriae</i> 5 (2b31 et 3b12) app. *33a and n. <i>De anima</i> 2.1 (412a 9-10) app. 19 and n. 2.1 (412a 19-22) app. 19 and n. 2.1 (412a 27-b9) app. 19 and n. <i>De interpretatione</i> 2 (16a20) app. *33a 2 (16a19-29) app. *33a and n. 2 (16a25-26) app. *33a and n. 2 (16a28) app. *33a and n. 4 (16b26-17a2) app. *33a and n. 4 (16b27) app. *33a 5 (17a16 et 18) app. *33a and n. 7 (17b8) app. *33a and n. <i>Ethica Nicomachea</i> 8-9 20a-e n. <i>Metaphysica</i> 4.22 (1022b 32-36) app. *33b and n. <i>Poetica</i> 1 (1447b9-11) app. 27 6 (1450a3-25) app. 27 6 (1450a38-b15) app. 27 15 (1454a26) app. 27 20 (1456b20-21) app. *32 and n. 20 (1456b34-36) app. *33a 20 (1456b38-1457a10) app. *32 20 (1457a10-14) app. *33a and n. 20 (1457a23-27) app. *32 21 (1457a31-b1) app. *33b and n. 21 (1457b1-3) app. *33b and n., app. *33c and n. 21 (1457b2-3) app. *32 21 (1457b3-6) app. *32, app. *33a and n.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

144 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

21 (1457b6-9)	app. *33b and n.	ASCLEPIADES (3 BC)	
21 (1457b6-13)	app. *33b	T4 Sens	app. 10
21 (1457b7-9)	app. *32	CALLIM(ACHUS) (3 BC)	
21 (1457b13-25)	app. *33b and n.	<i>Aetia</i> I fr. 1 (p. 57.1-7	
21 (1457b23-25) = Empedocles 31		Massimilla)	app. 10
DK B152	app. *33b	<i>Aetia</i> I fr. 4	15 n.
21(1457b 33-1458a17)	app. *33c	<i>Aetia</i> I fr. 1.7	app. 10
21 (1457b25-33)	app. *33c and n.	<i>Aetia</i> III fr. 57.1	app. 10
21 (1457b33-35)	*33c n.	<i>Aetia</i> III fr. 75.65	app. 10
21 (1457b35)	app. *33b	<i>Epigrammata</i> 27 (= AP 9.507)	
21 (1458a1-2)	*33c n	Pfeiffer 2 p. 88	app. 11
21 (1458a2-5)	*33c n.	<i>Hymni</i> IV.31 (Pfeiffer 2	
22 (1458a34-b3)	app. *32	p. 19)	app. 10
25 (1460b11-13)	app. *32	CHOERILUS SAMIUS (5 BC)	
<i>Rhetorica</i>		Choerilus T5 <i>PEG</i> 1987	
3.2 (1404b39-1405a10)	app. *33b	pp. 188-89	app. 21
3.2 (1405a 10-11)	app. *33b and n.	CHRYSIPPUS (3 BC)	
3.2 (1405b21-28)	app. *33b and n.	<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
3.3 (1406a10-35)	app. *33b and n.	fr. 179 <i>SVF</i> 2 p. 52 (= Simpl.	
3.6 (1407b31-32)	app. *33b and n.	in <i>Aristot. Categ.</i> 12a26,	
3.6 (1408a 4-9)	app. *33b and n.	c. 10)	app. *33b
3.7 (1408b10-13)	app. *33b and n.	frr. 933-40 <i>FDS</i> 3 pp.	
3.9 (1409b8)	app. 24 and n.	1184-1196	app. *33b
3.10 (1410b13-15)	app. *33b	CIC(ERO) (106-43 BC)	
3.11 (1411b25-32)	app. *33b	<i>Tuscul(anae)</i> 1.10.22	app. 19
<i>Topica</i>			and n.
6.5 (142b31-35)	9B n, app. 9C	COMMENTARIUM IN ILIADEM (1 BC)	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		see <i>POxy.</i> 8.1086.11-18	
<i>De Philosophia</i> fr. 27		CRATES MALL(OTES) (2 BC)	
Ross p. 95	app. 19	T 7 Broggiato	app. 9C
<i>De poetis</i> frr. 72-73 Rose	app. 27	T 20 Broggiato	app. 9B
Gigon T 19 p. 135 A,		F 78 Broggiato	app. 28A
linn. 33-36	app. 19 and n.	F 94 Broggiato	app. 9B
Gigon T 19 p. 135 B,		CRITOLAUS (2 BC)	
linn. 33-36	app. 19 and n.	<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
Gigon Tit. 82 nr. 142	app. *32	fr. 3 Wehrli	app. 3C
Gigon Tit. 82 nr. 143	app. *32 and n.	fr. 15 Wehrli	app. 19 and n.
Gigon Tit. 82 nr. 144	app. *32 and n.	DEMETRIUS (Alexandrinae	
[ARISTOTELES]		quae dicitur aetatis)	
<i>Magna Moralia</i> 2.15-17	20a and n.	<i>De elocutione</i> 36	app. 10
<i>Rhetorica ad Alexandrum</i>		<i>De elocutione</i> 81	app. *33b
25.1 (1435a34-36)	app. 32	<i>De elocutione</i> 190-235	app. 10
25.4 (1435b11-16)	app. 32	DEMETRIUS PHALERAeus (4 BC)	
ATHENAEUS (2-3 AD)		<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Deipnosopistae</i> 10.77, 12.71,		133 SOD	app. 23A
14.33	27 n.		

DEXIPPUS (4 AD)		
<i>In Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium</i>		
1.4 (CAG 4.2 p. 12.3-11)	app. *32	
DICAEARCHUS (4 BC)		
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		
fr. 42 Wehrli (= 48 Mirhady)	app. 23A	
DIO CHRYSOSTOMUS (1-2 AD)		
<i>Orat.</i> 53 (De Budé		
pp. 141.17-142.1)	app. 9B	
DIODEGENES LAERTIUS (2BC)		
<i>Vitae Philosophorum</i> 3.7	22 n.	
<i>Vitae Philosophorum</i> 10.28	app. 6	
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS (1 BC)		
<i>De compositione verborum</i> 2.1		
(= Arist. Tit. 82 nr. 142 Gigon,		
Theodectes XXXII 3.5 Baiterus-		
Sauppe p. 248)	app. *32 and n.	
<i>De compositione</i>		
<i>verborum</i> 7.1	app. *32 and n.	
<i>De Demosthene</i> 48 (= Arist. Tit. 82		
nr. 143 Gigon)	app. *32 and n.	
<i>De Thucydide</i> 22.1-2	app. *32 and n.	
DIONYSIUS THRAX (2 BC)		
<i>Ars grammatica</i> 1		
(Uhlig pp. 5.1-6.3)	9A n. , app. 9B	
12.21-22 (Uhlig p. 44.2-5)	app. 23A	
20 (Uhlig pp. 86-88)	app. 24	
20 (Uhlig pp. 96-100)	app. 24	
20.8 (Uhlig p. 97)	24 n.	
<i>LGGA</i> s.v. Dionysius [14]	app. 13	
EMPEDOCLES (5 BC)		
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		
31 DK B152	app. *33b and n.	
EPICURUS (342-270 BC)		
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		
fr. 123 Usener p. 140.8-9		
et p. 365.19-21 (= Diano p. 78;		
Arrighetti fr. [1] 13 p. 11.12-13		
et fr. [48] [1] 13 1 p. 425;		
Laks p. 14.25-27)	app. 6	
ERATOSTHENES (3 BC)		
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		
<i>FGrHist.</i> II B 241 T 8	app. 9A	
EUDEMUS (4 BC)		
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		
fr. 2 Wehrli	app. 13	
EUPOLIS (5 BC)		
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		
<i>Astrateutoi</i> 36 PCG 5 p. 315	22 n.	
EURIPIDES (5 BC)		
<i>Helen</i> 12-14	*33a n.	
<i>Meleager</i> 46 fr. 515		
<i>TrGF</i> 5.1 p. 556	app. 24 and n.	
<i>Phoenissae</i> 139	app. *33b and n.	
EUSTATHIUS (12 AD)		
<i>Commentarii ad Homeri</i>		
<i>Iliadem</i> 4.704.8		
(comm. in <i>Il.</i> 23.153-54)	app. 24	
HERODOTUS (5 BC)		
<i>Historiae</i> 4.55		
4.76.4		
5.94.2		
HESIODUS (8-7 BC)		
<i>Opera et Dies</i> 11	app. 28A and n.,	
	app. 28B and n.	
<i>Theogonia</i> 1	app. 28A	
HESYCHIUS (6 AD)		
<i>Lexicon</i> α 31 s.v.		
ἄζα	app. *30B and n.	
<i>Lexicon</i> ε 66 s.v.		
ἔρνη	app. *33b	
ε nr. 68 s.v. ἔρνος	app. *33b	
<i>Lexicon</i> ρ 537 s.v. ῥυτῆρι		
κρούων	app. 29A	
<i>Lexicon</i> ρ 538 s.v.		
ῥυτῆρος	app. 29A	
HIERONYMUS (3 BC)		
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		
fr. 1 Wehrli = fr. 1A White	app. 13	
fr. 2 Wehrli = fr. 3B White	app. 3C	
<i>De Isocrate</i> (38A White)	22 n.	
<i>De figuris Isocraticis</i> (39 White)	22 n.	
HOMERUS		
<i>Ilias</i>		
1.95	app. 25	
2.763	app. 25 and n.	
2.778	app. *33b and n.	
3.21	app. *33b and n.	
3.52	app. *33b and n.	
3.69	app. *33b and n.	
3.90	app. *33b and n.	
4.485	app. *33b	

146 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

4.487	app. *30A¹ and n.	MIMNERMUS (6 BC)	
7.247-8	app. 23B	<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
8.47	app. *33b	p. 84 West (= T 10 A Allen)	app. 10
1.95	app. 25	NAUSIPHANES TEIUS (4-3 BC)	
14.433	app. 24 and n.	<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
15.330	app. 25	75 DK A8 (= Leucippus 67	
15.333-6	app. 25	DK A2)	app. 6
21.1	app. 24 and n.	NICERATUS HERACLEOTA (5 BC)	
23.154	app. 24 and n.	<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Odyssea</i>		nr. 564 <i>Suppl. Hell.</i> p. 278	app. 21
5. 203-04	app. 24 and n.	<i>FGrHist</i> III C 696 33c	21 n.
9.124	app. *33b and n.	ORPHICI HYMNI	
11.163-20	app. 25 and n.	3.3	app. *33b
16.220	app. 24 and n.	5.5	app. *33b
21.226	app. 24 and n.	PANAETIUS RHODIUS (2 BC)	
23.241	app. 24 and n.	<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
INSCRIPTIONES		T4 Alesse	app. 13
<i>IG</i> 7.3458.1	app. 10	T45 Alesse	app. 8
<i>IG</i> 11.2 226B5	10 n.	PAPYRI	
ISOCRATES (4 DC)		<i>PLitLond.</i> 182 linn. 10-121	
<i>Panathenaicus</i> 34	app. 22	(Wouters pp. 72-73)	app. 24
JOANNES PHILOPONUS (6 AD)		<i>POxy.</i> 13.1611, fr. 1 col. 5	
<i>De vocabulis quae diversum</i>		linn. 102-20	app. 21
<i>significatum exhibent secundum</i>		<i>POxy.</i> 15.1800 fr. 2 col. 2	
<i>differentiam accentus,</i>		linn. 65-67	app. 21
Recensio B α 8.2 s.v. ἀνακῆς		PAUSANIAS (2 AD)	
(Daly p. 56)	app. *33b	<i>Graeciae Descriptio</i>	
<i>In Aristotelis Categorias</i>		9.26.6	app. *15, 28A and n.
<i>Commentarium, Proemium</i>	app. *32	9.31.4	app. 28A
LEUCIPPUS		PHILO (1 BC-1 AD)	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		<i>De congressu eruditionis</i>	
67 DK A2	app. 6	<i>gratia</i> 148	app. 9C
LUCIANUS (2 AD)		149	app. *32
<i>Iudicium Vocalium</i> 10	19 n.	PHILITAS (4-3 BC)	
LYCO		<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		T 24 Sbardella	
fr. 6 Wehrli = nr. 3B		(= T7b Spanoudakis)	app. 10
SFOD 2004	app. 3C	PHILOXENUS ALEXANNDRIUS (1 AD)	
MARCELLINUS (4 AD?)		<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Thucydidis Vita</i> 2, 16, 54, 55	app. 21	fr. ** 689 Theodoridis (ap.	
Jones p. XV	app. 21	Apollonii Dyscol. <i>De</i>	
<i>FGrHist.</i> III C 696 33b	app. 21	<i>coniunctionibus</i> Schneider	
MELANIPPIDES (5 BC)		p. 248.12-13)	app. 24 , app. *32
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>		PHOTIUS (9 AD)	
757-766 <i>PMG</i> pp. 392-395	app. 21	<i>Bibliotheca</i> cod. 213, 171b2-7	
		Bekker (= Henry p. 124)	

PINDARUS			QUINTILIANUS (1 AD)	
<i>Isthmia</i> 8.25	app. *33b and n.		<i>Institutio Oratoria</i> 1.4.18	
<i>Pyth.</i> 4.231	app. *33b		(= Arist. Tit. 82 nr. 144	
PISANDER (7 BC)			Arist. Gigon 1987)	app. *32
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			RHETORICA AD HERENNIUM (1 AC)	
PEG T 4 p. 165	app. 13		4.43-45	*33b n.
PLATO COMICUS (5-4 BC)			SATYRUS (3-2 BC)	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>	
PCG VII T 4 (p. 431)	app. 21		Schorn fr. 16	app. 21
T 13 (p. 433)	app. 8		Schorn fr. *34	21 n.
PLATO PHIL. (5-4 BC)			SCHOLIA IN ARISTOPHANEM	
<i>Cratylus</i>			<i>In Acharnenses</i> 703a-d	app. 21
388c	app. *33a		<i>In Vespas</i> 947b	app. 21
388d	app. *33a		SCHOLIA IN CALLIMACHUM	
393d	*33a n.		IX.34-33 in <i>Ia</i> . XIII, fr. 203	
<i>Leges</i> 770a	app. *33b		(Pfeiffer 1 p. 205)	app. 10
<i>Phaedrus</i> 246e	app. 24 and n.		SCHOL(IA) IN DION(YSIUM) THR(ACEM)	
278e	app. 22		PROLEG(OMENA) VOSS(IANA)	
<i>Symposium</i> 174a	app. 28A		Hilgard p. 3.24-26	app. 9A and n.
PLUTARCHUS (1-2 AD)			LOND(INENSIA)	
<i>Quaestiones Convivales</i>			Hilgard p. 448.6-7	app. 9A and n.
736E	app. 28A		Hilgard p. 515.19-29	*32 n.
<i>Pericles</i> 8.5 et 11.1	app. 21		VAT(ICANA)	
[PLUTARCHUS]			Hilgard pp. 290.30-291.28	app. 24
<i>Placita Philosophorum</i> 4.2 898C			SCHOL(IA) IN HOM(ERUM)	
(p. 115.17-19 Mau = Arist.			<i>in Iliadem</i>	
Gigon p. 135 col. A,			2.621	app. 25
linn. 33-36)	app. 19 and n.		2.629a	app. 25
POAETI MELICI			9.15	app. *33b
<i>PMG</i> Fragmenta adespota			15.333b	app. 25
9 nr. 927 p. 495	app. *33b		16.4	app. *33b
POLEMON			19. 56-58c, 58 b ² /c ² (Erbse	
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			1975 pp. 583.38-584.46)	app. 24
Preller p. 40 fr. V			22.441b (Erbse	
(= FHG 3 fr. 5 p. 117)	app. 21		pp. 347.35-36)	app. *33b
POLLUX (2 AD)			23.153 (Erbse	
<i>Onomasticon</i> 7.87	app. 29A ,		p. 395.70-73)	app. 24 and n.
	app. *29B		<i>in Odysseam</i>	
POSIDIPPUS (3 BC)			3.467	app. 25
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			11.177	app. 25
T5 Austin-Bastianini	app. 10		11.587	app. 30A ¹
POSIDONIUS APAMEUS (2-1 BC)			15.6	app. 25
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			21.278	app. 25
T2a Theiler 1, p. 7	app. 13		22.184	app. 30A ¹
Ps.-HERODIANUS			23.332	app. *33a
<i>De Figuris</i> 7 (Hajdú p. 109.18				
= <i>RhGr</i> 3 p. 89.12)	app. 28A			

148 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

SCHOLIA IN PINDARUM			
in <i>Nem.</i> 5 85c (Drachmann			
p. 112.19-20)	app. *33b		
SCHOLIA IN PLATONEM			
in <i>Symposium</i>			
174a (Greene p. 56 = Cufalo			
pp. 96-97)	app. *29A		
SELEUCUS ALEXANDRINUS (1 AD)			
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			
<i>FHG</i> 3 p. 500 a			
s.v. Seleucus [3] Homericus in			
<i>LGGA</i>	app. 8		
SEXTUS EMPIRICUS			
<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>			
1.44	app. 9C		
1.47	app. 9C		
1.52	app. 9C		
1.53	app. 9C		
1.54	app. 9C		
1.56	app. 9C		
1.79	app. 9B		
1.248	app. 9B		
SIMPLICIUS (6 AD)			
<i>In Aristotelis Categorias</i>			
<i>Commentarium</i> 4 in Arist. 1b25			
(<i>CAG</i> 8 p. 71.22-72.5)	app. *32		
<i>in Aristotelis Categorias</i>			
<i>Commentarium</i> 10 in Arist. 12a26			
(<i>CAG</i> 8 p. 394.31-34)	app. *33b		
SOPHOCLES (5 BC)			
<i>Ajax</i> 19	app. *33b and n.		
<i>Oed.</i> Col. 897-900	app. 29A		
<i>TrGF</i> 4 F 152.3 p. 168	app. *33c		
	and n.		
STOBAEUS			
<i>Anthologium</i>			
1.49.1a (Wachsmuth 1 p. 319.6-8			
= Arist. Gigon, T 19 p. 135 col. B,			
linn. 33-36)	app. 19 and n.		
1.49.32 (Wachsmuth 1 pp.			
366.25-367.2 = Theophr.			
269 FHS&G)	app. 19 and n.		
STRATO (3 BC)			
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			
5B Sharples	app. 3C		
47 Sharples	app. 19		
SUDA			
s.v. Θουκυδίδης (Θ 414)	app. 21		
s.v. Σκῆνος (Σ 573)	app. *33a		
s.v. Κλισία (K 1811)	app. *33a		
s.v. Νύσσα (N 617)	app. *33a		
THEAGENES (6 BC)			
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			
8 DK 1a	app. 9B, app. 9C		
THEOCRITUS (3 BC)			
<i>Idyllia</i> 7.40	10 n.		
THEODECTES (4 BC)			
XXXII 3.5 Baiterus-Sauppe			
p. 248	app. *32 and n.		
THEOPHRASTUS ERESIUS (4-3 BC)			
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			
11 nr. 7 FHS&G	app. 3C		
18 nr. 17 FHS&G	app. 4A app. 4B,		
	app. 4C, app. 23A		
66 nr. 9 FHS&G	app. 3A		
78 FHS&G	app. *32		
162 FHS&G	app. 19		
269 FHS&G	app. 19 and n.		
673A FHS&G	app. *32		
683 =	app. *32 and n., app. *33b		
689A FHS&G	app. *32, app. *33b		
689B FHS&G	app. *32, app. *33b		
690 FHS&G	app. *32, app. *33b		
727.7 FHS&G	app. 21		
727.8 FHS&G	app. 21		
Appendix 9	app. *33a, app. *33b,		
	app. *33c		
<i>Historia Plantarum</i> 1.1.9	app. *33b		
THEOPOMPUS (4 BC)			
<i>Testimonia et Fragmenta</i>			
115 fr. 91 <i>FGrHist</i>	app. 21		
TIMON (3 BC)			
<i>Silloi</i> nr. 804 <i>Suppl. Hell.</i>			
pp. 378-79 = 30 Di Marco	22 n.		
nr. 106 (app.) et 107			
<i>Suppl. Hell.</i> p. 39			
TIMOTHEUS (5-4 BC)			
<i>Persae</i> 92-93	app. *33b		
TRYPH(ON)			
<i>De tropis</i> 2.4.3 West			
p. 237	app. *33b and n.		

TRYPHON ALEXANDRINUS (1 BC)

Testimonia et Fragmenta

ap. Apoll(onium) Dysc(olum),

De coniunctionibus, Schneider

p. 247.23-25 = fr. 41

Von Velsen p. 35 app. **24**

ap. Apoll(onium) Dysc(olum),

De coniunctionibus, Schneider

pp. 248.14-249.20 = Tryphon.

fr. 57 Von Velsen pp. 43-44 app. **24**

De tropis RhGr 3

p. 198.18 app. ***32**

VITA DIONYSII PERIEGETAE

62 Kassel pp. 72.59-60

(= Crates F 78) app. **28A**

VITA GRAECA ARATI

Vita 3 (Martin p. 16 col. b

linn. 12-14) app. **7** and n., app. **11**

VITA THUCYDIDIS ANONIMA

1, 10 app. **21**

ZENO SIDONIUS (2 BC)

Testimonia et Fragmenta

Fr. 12.16 Angeli-Colaizzo app. **21**

INDEX OF THE NAMES

Achilleios / Achillēios ***33c**

Agathon, the tragedian **21** and n.

Agrianus, month of – ***17a**

Alabanda **13**

Alexandria **7** n., **13** n.,

Alexandrians **13**

Ammon, Egyptian Archive of – **3A** n.,
3B n.

Andronicus the Peripathetic **13** and n.

Androtion, *Atthis* **21** and n.

Anticleia **25** and n.

Antidorus of Cyme **9A** and n.

Antimachus of Colophon **10** n.

Antimachus, *Lyde* **11** n.

Apamea in Syria **13** and n.

Apollo ***16**

Apollodorus **9A** n.

Apollodorus of Athens, **9A** n.

Apollodorus of Athens, *Chronology* **6**
and n.

Apollonius *Malakos* (i.e. ‘the Soft’) **13**
and n.

Apollonius Molon (i.e. ‘the comer’) **13**
and n.

Apollonius, poet of the *Argonautica* **13**
and n.

Aratus **7** and n., **11** and n.

Archelaus **21** and n.

Aristarchus **12** nr. 3 and n., **13** and n.,
25, **28A** and n.

Aristo **3C** and n.

Aristocles **13** and n.

Ariston **21** and n.

Aristotle (of Stagira) **3A**, **8**, **9B**, **9C**, **11** n.,
19 and n., ***33a-c** n.

–, *Ethica Eudemia* 7 **20** n.

–, *Ethica Nicomachea* **20** and n.

–, *Poetics* **27** n.

–, *Categories* ***32**

[Aristotle], *Magna Moralia* 2.15-17 **20** n.

Asclepiades of Samos called ‘of Sicily’
10 and n.

Athenaeus of Naucratis **10** n.

Athens **7** n.

Boeotian **28A**

Callimachus **7** and n., **11** n

–, *Reply to Praxiphanes* **11**

Calypso **24**

Carneiscus. Epicurean philosopher **12** nr.
1a n.

–, *Philistas* **20a-e** and n.

Choirilus, poet **21** and n.

Choirylus, son of Tharsynon **14** and n.

Clearchus **20** n.

Critias **23B**

Critolaus of Phaselis **3A**, **3B**, **3C** and n.,
19 and n.

Cyclesis, son of Mnasilas ***16**

Damosthenes, father of Praxiphanes (not
our philosopher) ***1G**, ***16** and n.

Delians **14**

Demetrius Lacon **31**

Demetrius of Byzantium **27**

Dies, son of Damosthenes ***16**

Dionousophaeis, son of Praxiphanes ***1F**
and n., ***15**

Dionysiphanes **1C** n., ***1F** n., **1D**, **14**

[Dion]ysi[o]do(rus) **26**

Dionysius Thrax **1C**, **9B-C** and n., **13** and n.

Dionysophanes of Mytilene **1C** and n.,
***1F** n., **9A**, **9B**

Dionysoi, two **10**

Dōros ***33a**

Epicureans **6** n.,

Epicurus **20** n.

–, *Letter to Eurylochus* **6** and n.

Eudemus **13** and n.

Eratosthenes of Cyrene, *Grammatics* **9A**
and n.

Helicon **28A** and n.

Hermocrates **23B**

Hesiod, commentaries on – **9A** and n.,
18 nr. 8, **28A**, **28B**

–, *Theogony* **28A**

–, *Works and Days* **28A** and n., **28B**

Hieronymus **3C** and n., **13** and n.

- Homer **9A** and n., **12** nr. 3, **18** nr. 7, **23b**, **24**, **25**, **29C**
- Isocrates **18** nr. *3, **22** and n.
- Laertes **24**
- Leonides the Stoic **13** and n.,
- Lyciscus **3C** and n.
- Lyco **3C** and n.
- Lysimachus ‘fight solver’ **2A**
- Macedonian **19**, **23**
- Melanipides, **21** and n.
- Memnon *On the Acropolis* **21** and n.
- Meneclis, the orator **13** and n.
- Mimnermus of Smyrna, ‘said of Colophon’, author of *Smyrnea* and *Nanno* **10** and n.
- Muses **28A**
- , from Helicon **28A**
- , from Pieria **28A**
- Mytileneans ***16**
- Nausiphanes **6**
- Niceratus, the epic poet **21** and n.
- Nicomachus, father of Aristotle **19**
- Odysseus **24**, **25** and n.
- Oidesipous / Oidipous ‘Swollen footed’ **2A**, **2B**
- Panaetius, the philosopher **8**, **13** and n.
- Peisander, Rhodian, poet of the *Heracleia* **13** and n.
- Pelop **24**
- Penelope **25**
- Pericles **21** and n.
- Peripatetic /-s **3A**, **8**, **9B**, **12** nr. 3 n.
- Persephoneia, ‘destroyer through murder’ **2B**
- Persepolis, ‘destroyer of cities’ **2A**
- Phaenias, son of Posidonius ***16**
- Philistas **12** nr. 1a n.
- Philistas, Epicurean, friend of Praxiphanes **20a-e**, **20d**
- Philitas of Cos **10** and n.
- Philomelus **27** and n.
- Phormio **3C** and n.
- (P)yrrippus, rhetor **10** and n.
- Plato, Peripatetic student of Aristotle **8**
- Plato, poet of old comedy **8**, **21** and n.
- Plato, Rhodian philosopher student of Panaetius **8**
- Plato, student of Praxiphanes **8** and n.
- Plato, the socratic philosopher **11** n., **18** ***3**, **22** and n., **23A**, **23B**, **24**
- , *Lysis* **20** n.
- , *Cratylus* ***33a** n.
- , *Timaeus* **23A**
- Porphry **12** nr. 5, **23B**
- , *By Question and Answer* ***32**
- , *To Gedalius* ***32**
- Poseidonius, Stoic philosopher **13** and n.
- Posidippus **10** and n.
- Praxiphanes ‘author of illustrious deeds’ **2A** and n., **2B**
- and Callimachus **7** and n., **10**, **11**
- , eponymous archon of Rhodes ***1E** and n., ***17A**, ***17B**
- , father of Dionousophaeis ***1F** and n., ***15**
- , ‘grammarian’ **9A** and n., **9B**
- , of Mytilene **1A** and n., **1C**, **7**, **9A**, **10**, ***16**
- , of Rhodes **1B**, **3A**, **5**, **13**, **19**
- , on the elements and parts of speech **18** nr. ***5** ***32**, **24**, ***33**
- , on rare words **18** nr. 6, **30A-B**, **31**
- , ‘Peripatetic’ **3A-C**, **9B**, **9C**
- , *proxenos* in Delos **14** and n.
- , son of Damosthenes, *proxenos* in Eresus **1A** n., ***1G**, ***16**
- , son of Dionysiphanes **1C** n., **1D**, **14**
- , son of Dionysophanes of Mytilene **1C** and n., **9A**, **9B**
- , Theophrastus ‘companion and friend’ **4A**, **23A**
- , Theophrastus’ student **28A**, **4B**, **28A**, **28B**
- , commentary on Hesiod’ *Works and Days* **18** nr. 8, **28A**, **28B**
- , commentary on Homer’ *Odyssey* **18** nr. 7, **25**
- , commentary on Plato’s *Timaeus* **18** nr. 10, **23A** and **23B**

152 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- , commentary on Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* **18** nr. 9, **29A**
- , composition (on friendship) **18** nr. *4, **20e**
- , dialogue on *Plato's and Isocrates's discussion on Poets* **18** nr. *3, **22**
- , *On History* **18** nr. 1, **21**
- , *On Poems* **18** nr. 2, **27** and n.
- , on the world **18** nr. 11, **19** and n.
- Praxiteles **3C** and n.
- Prytanis **3C** and n.

- Rhodes **1B**, **3A**, **5**, **7** n., **10** n., **13** and n., **19**
- Rhodians **13**

- Seleucus, the grammarian, *On Philosophy* **8**
- Simmius (or Simias), Rhodian scholar **13** and n.
- Socrates **23A-23B**
- Sophocles **29A-C**
- , *Oedipus at Colonus* **18** nr. 9, **29A**
- Stagira **19**
- Stesichorus 'chorus founder' **2B**
- Strabo **13** n.
- Strato of Lampsacus **3A**, **3B**, **3C** and n., **19** and n.

- Stratocles **13** and n.

- Telchines **10** and n.
- Telemachus **25**
- Theagenes **9C**
- Theocritus **10** n.
- Theognostus **2B**
- Theon, *Aratus' life* **7** n.
- Theophrastus, and his associates **4D** and n., ***32**
- , of Eresus **3B**, **3C**, **4A**, **4B**, **4C** and n., **5**, **19** and n., **23A**, ***32** and n.
- , the Ionian **3A**
- , *On the Elements of the Speech* (or of the Sentence) ***32**
- , *On friendship* **20** n.
- Thespieae ***1F** n., ***15** and n., **28A** n.
- Thracian **19**
- Thucydides, son of Melesias **21** and n.
- Thucydides, son of Olorus **21** and n.
- Thucydides, the Acherdousian **21** and n.
- Thucydides, the Pharsalian **21** and n.
- Timaeus **23A**, **23B**

- Zeus **24**
- Zopyrus **12** nr. 1b n., **20d**

CONCORDANCE

Preller 1842	Matelli	*15	
p. 5	13	*16	
p. 5, 7-8	19	*17A	
p. 8	3C	*17B	
p. 15	22	18	
Fr. I	27	19	p. 5, 7-8
Fr. II	21	20a	
Fr. III	31	20b	
Fr. IV	24	20c	
Fr. V	23A	20d	
Fr. VI	28A	20e	
Fr. VII	29A	21	Fr. II
Fr. VIII	30A¹	22	p. 15
Fr. VIII	*30B	23A	Fr. V
		23B	
Matelli	Preller 1842	24	Fr. IV
1A = 7, 10		25	
1B = 3A, 13, 19		26	
1C = 9A, 9B		27	Fr. I
1D = 14		28A	Fr. VI
*1E = *17A, *17B		28B	
*1F = *15		29A	Fr. VII
*1G = *16		*29B	
2A		*29C	
2B		30A¹	Fr. VIII
3A		30A²	
3B = 19		*30B	Fr. VIII
3C	p. 8	31	Fr. III
4A = 23A		*32	
4B = 28A		*33a	
4C = 28B		*33b	
*4D = *32		*33c	
5 = 19		*34	
6			
7		Brink 1946	Matelli
8		T1	14
9A		T2a	3C
9B		Fr. T2b, T7	19
9C		T3	13
10		T4	6
11		T5a	11
12		T5b	7
13	p. 5	T6	10
14		T8	9A

154 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

T9a	9B	14	T1
T9b	9C	*15	
Fr. 1	27	*16	
Fr. 2	22	*17A	
Fr. 3	25	*17B	
Fr. 4	24	18	
Fr. 5	28A	19	T2b, T7
Fr. 6	23A	20a	Fr. 11a
Fr. 7	31	20b	
Fr. 8	29A	20c	Fr. 11b
Fr. 9	30A ¹	20d	Fr. 11c
Fr. 9 (app.)	*30B	20e	Fr. 11d
Fr. 10	21	21	Fr. 10
Fr. 11a	20a	23A	Fr. 6
Fr. 11b	20c	23B	
Fr. 11c	20d	24	Fr. 4
Fr. 11d	20e	25	Fr. 3
		26	
Matelli	Brink 1946	27	Fr. 1
1A = 7, 10		28A	Fr. 5
1B = 3A, 13, 19		28B	
1C = 9A, 9B		29A	Fr. 8
1D = 14		*29B	
*1E = *17A, *17B		*29C	
*1F = *15		30A ¹	Fr. 9
*1G = *16		30A ²	
2A		*30B	Fr. 9 (app.)
2B		31	Fr. 7
3A		*32	
3B = 19		*33a-c	
3C	T2a	*34	
4A = 23A		Wehrli 1969	Matelli
4B = 28A		1	13
4C = 28B		2	19
4D = 32		3	3C
5 = 19		4	14
6	T4	5	6
7	T5b	6	8
8		7	20a, c-e
9A	T8	8	9C
9B	T9a	9	9B
9C	T9b	10	9A
10	T6	11	22
11	T5a	12	27
12		13	24
13	T3		

14	31	19	Fr. 2
15	10	20a	Fr. 7 (fr. VIII)
16	11	20b	
17	7	20c	Fr. 7 (col. VIII)
18	21	20d	Fr. 7 (col. X)
19	23A	20e	Fr. 7 (col. XIII.3-19)
20	25	21	Fr. 18
21	30A ¹	22	Fr. 11
22a	28A	23A	Fr. 19
22b	28B	23B	
23	29A	24	Fr. 13
		25	Fr. 20
Matelli	Wehrli 1969	26	
1A = 7, 10		27	Fr. 12
1B = 3A, 13, 19		28A	Fr. 22a
1C = 9A, 9B		28B	Fr. 22b
1D = 14		29A	Fr. 23
*1E = *17A, *17B		*29B	
*1F = *15		*29C	
*1G = *16		30A ¹	Fr. 21
2A		30A ²	
2B		*30B	
3A		31	Fr. 14
3B = 19		*32	
3C	Fr. 3	*33a	
4A = 23A		*33b	
4B = 28A		*33c	
4C = 28B		*34	
*4D = *32			
5 = 19		Matelli	CPF 86 Praxiph.
6	Fr. 5	3A	T1
7	Fr. 17	10	T4
8	Fr. 6	25	T2
9A	Fr. 10	26	T3
9B	Fr. 9		
9C	Fr. 8	Matelli	Bagordo
10	Fr. 15	*29B	Nr. 77 *F1
11	Fr. 16		
12		Matelli	LGGA Praxiph.
13	Fr. 1	1A = 7, 10	
14	Fr. 4	1B = 3A, 13, 19	
*15		1C = 9A, 9B	
*16		1D = 14	
*17A		*1E = *17A, *17B	
*17B		*1F = *15	
18		*1G = *16	

156 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Matelli	<i>LGGA Praxiph.</i>	19	X
2A		20a	X
2B		20b	X
3A		20c	X
3B = 19		20d	X
3C	X	20e	X
4A = 23A		21	X
4B = 28A		22	X
4C = 28B		23A	X
*4D = *32		23B	
5 = 19		24	X
6	X	25	X
7	X	26	
8	X	27	X
9A	X	28A	X
9B	X	28B	X
9C	X	29A	X
10	X	*29B	
11	X	*29C	
12		30A ¹	X
13	X	30A ²	
14	X	*30B	
*15		31	X
*16		*32	
*17A		*33a	
*17B		*33b	
18		*33c	

Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica
The Sources, Text and Translation

Andrea Martano

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	159
ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED	162
TEXTS	
I. Life 1a-f	176
II. Writings	
Titles 2	180
Wisdom 3	184
Music and Ethics 4-7	188
Pleasure 8-9	198
Wine 10-14	202
Homer 15-24	208
Hesiod 25	224
Alcman 26-27	224
Sappho 28-29	228
Stesichorus 30-32	234
Lasus 33	242
Pindarus 34-35	246
Simonides 36-38	252
Anacreon 39	258

158 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Satyr Play 40	262
Thespis 41	264
Aeschylus 42-44	266
Tragedy 45	272
Comedy 46-47	276
Tales 48	282
Orators 49	284
III. Incerta 50-51	286
IV. Passages attributed by critics 52-64	288
INDEX OF SOURCES	316
INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED	318
INDEX OF NAMES	326
CONCORDANCE	329

INTRODUCTION

Since the edition of Ernestus Koepke in the second half of eighteenth century, the interest of scholarship in texts relating to Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica grew through another seven editions, including the two by Fritz Wehrli and another two by David Giordano¹.

With the aim of continuing and completing the efforts of the Project Theophrastus and the collection of volumes containing evidence of the activity of Aristotle's colleagues and students, this edition of the remains of Chameleon's works, more testimonies than fragments, offers to the community of scholars an updated view on the philosopher and literary-critic and his activity during the period bridging the Classical and Hellenistic ages.

The texts are divided in four sections (I-IV). The first (I) contains texts relating to Chamaeleon's *Life* (**1a-f**), the second (II) concerning his *Writings* (**2-49**), the third (III) texts *Uncertain* (**50-51**), attributed to Chamaeleon through emendation of text. In these sections the only criterion for including texts is the explicit attribution by name, even if through emendation. Texts presented here are sometimes more extended than Chamaeleon's 'fragment' itself as contained in previous editions in order to clarify the context of the work citing Chamaeleon.

The fourth (IV) contains twelve texts *Doubtfully Attributed* (**52-64**) to Chamaeleon by scholars, in which there's no evidence of name or quote that makes certain the attribution but the context itself. In these cases the attribution is clarified by the indication of the scholar who referred the text to Chamaeleon.

In all the sections the texts are arranged by brief headings that indicate the subject. In the second and third sections, where possible, a title in capital letters indicates the discipline (in the texts concerning philosophy: *e.g. Wisdom, Music and Ethics*, etc.) or the author or subject (in the texts concerning literary criticism: *e.g. Homer, Hesiod, Tragedy*, etc.) under which single texts are distinguished by brief headings. Where a title of Chamaeleon's book is cited, the scholar can find it in upper right margin of Chamaeleon's fragment.

¹ See abbreviations and editions used, *s.v.* Chamaeleon.

Parallel texts on the same topic with explicit indication of Chamaeleon as a source are grouped together under a single number and distinguished by alphabetic letters.

The texts printed here are based on previous editions of the authors citing Chamaeleon. Since the majority of texts relating literary criticism and biography include quotations of poets, in these cases the poetic text is presented by the last edition in use, even if the text included in the main edition shows some differences (*e.g.* Athenaeus, the main source for Chamaeleon's works), and the critical apparatus contains the emendations on the text. Reference to Wehrli's edition is given in the left margin of the Greek text at the point where Wehrli's fragment begins. Most of the fragments not included in Wehrli's edition were already included in Giordano's; this edition adds only the fragments numbered **50-64** in sections III and IV.

The texts are supplied with a dual apparatus. The first lists sources, parallel texts, and testimonia: it's useful to understand the textual background of Chamaeleon's ideas, to delineate the transmission and fortune of his theories and biographical reconstructions, and to indicate the passages quoted by the ancient Peripatetic in modern editions. Also strict parallels clearly deriving from Chamaeleon's work, but without indication of name, are always grouped in the first apparatus. The critical apparatus reports textual variants from manuscript tradition and scholarly emendations, above all in lyrical fragments.

Translation has been facilitated by David Mirhady mainly to assist the interpretation of texts. Brief notes follow them only to indicate the context and the main problems in interpreting the texts.

Lists of abbreviations and editions are provided at the beginning of this edition and contain each work used in sources and parallels. The edition is followed by a list of sources for the texts concerning Chamaeleon, a complete list of texts quoted in the first apparatus and a list of proper names cited in texts and notes.

A "pre-edition" of these fragments with a short commentary was prepared for the International Conference "Filosofi della Scuola di Aristotele - Cameleonte e Prassifane: frammenti per una storia della critica letteraria antica," held at the Istituto Svizzero in Rome the 5th-7th September 2007. Since that work, this edition have been improved by papers and discussion during the conference itself and by the help of scholars and friends also after the conference. I'm especially grateful to Elisabetta Matelli and Chri-

stopf Riedweg, Congress organizers, and to William Fortenbaugh and the Project Theophrastus. I'm also grateful to Professors Lamberto Di Gregorio, Carlo Maria Mazzucchi, Luigi Bravi, Ettore Cingano, Tiziano Dorandi, David Mirhady and Stefan Schorn, for their advice and criticism.

ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED

(a) Abbreviations and Standard Collections

BT	<i>Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana</i> . Leipzig B.G. Teubner - München K.G. Saur
CA	<i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> , ed. J.U. Powell. Oxonii 1925
CPF	<i>Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini. Testo e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina</i> , I.1*-1**. Firenze 1989-92
CPG	<i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> . I. Zenobius, Diogenianus, Plutarchus, Gregorius Cyprius cum appendice proverbiorum, edd. E.L. a Leutsch et F.G. Schneidewin. Göttingen 1839. II. Diogenianus, Gregorius Cyprius, Macarius, Aesopus, Apostolius et Arsenius, Mantissa proverbiorum, ed. E.L. a Leutsch. Göttingen 1851. Supplementum. Hildesheim 1961
D.-K.	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, griechisch und deutsch</i> , von H. Diels, zehnte Auflage herausgegeben von W. Kranz. Berlin 1960-1961
FGE	<i>Further Greek Epigrams</i> , ed. D.L. Page. Cambridge 1981
FGrHist	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , hrsg. von F. Jacoby. Berlin-Leiden 1923-58
FGrHist cont.	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker continued</i> , ed. by G. Schepens. Leiden 1998-
FHG	<i>Fragmenta historicorum graecorum</i> , auxerunt, notis et prolegomenis illustrarunt, indice plenissimo instruxerunt C. et Th. Muelleri. Parisiis 1848-85
FHS&G	Theophrastus of Eresus, <i>Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence</i> , ed. and. tr. by W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, R.W. Sharples, D. Gutas. Leiden - New York - Köln 1992
GG	<i>Grammatici Graeci</i>
IEG	<i>Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati</i> , ed. M.L. West, 2 voll. Oxonii 1989 ²
LG	<i>Lexicographi graeci</i>
LGGA	<i>Lessico dei grammatici greci antichi</i> , progetto diretto da F. Montanari, W. Lapini, F. Montana, L. Pagani. http://www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga/
LSJ	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , edd. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones. Oxford 1940 ⁹
PCG	<i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , edd. R. Kassel et C. Austin. Berlin - New York 1983-
PMG	<i>Poetae melici graeci</i> (PMG), ed. D.L. Page. Oxonii 1962 <i>Poetarum melicorum graecorum fragmenta</i> , post D.L. Page ed. M. Davies. Oxonii 1991

<i>PSI</i>	<i>Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto. Papiri greci e latini.</i> Firenze 1922-
<i>RE</i>	<i>Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , ed. G. Wissowa et al. Stuttgart 1894-1978
<i>SA</i>	<i>Die schule des Aristoteles</i> , ed. F. Wehrli. Basel-Stuttgart 1967-92
<i>SVF</i>	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , ed. H. von Arnim. Leipzig (1905)-(1924)
<i>TrGF</i>	<i>Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta</i> , v. 1, <i>Didascaliae tragicae, catalogi tragicorum, testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum</i> , ed. B. Snell, editio correctior et addendis aucta cur. R. Kannicht. Göttingen 1986; v. 3, <i>Aeschylus</i> , ed. S. Radt. Göttingen 1985; v. 4, <i>Sophocles</i> , ed. S. Radt. Göttingen 1977; v. 5, <i>Euripides</i> , ed. R. Kannicht. Göttingen 2004
W = Wehrli	F. Wehrli, <i>Die schule des Aristoteles</i> . Basel-Stuttgart 1967-92

(b) Ancient and Byzantine Works and Authors

[Acro] in <i>Hor. Carm.</i>	<i>Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium vetustiora</i> , rec. O. Keller. Lipsiae 1902-1904
Aelian. <i>Var. Hist.</i>	<i>Claudii Aeliani Varia historia</i> , ed. M. Dilts. Leipzig 1974
Aelius Theon	<i>Aelius Théon, Progymnasmata</i> , texte établi et traduit par M. Patillon. Paris 1997
Alcaeus	cf. Sappho
Alcman	<i>Alcman, Fragmenta</i> , edidit, veterum testimonia collegit C. Calame. Romae 1983
Amm. Marc.	<i>Ammiani Marcellini Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt</i> , ed. W. Seyfarth, 2 voll. Leipzig 1978
Anacreon	<i>Anacreon</i> , edidit B. Gentili, Romae 1958
<i>AB</i>	<i>Anecdota graeca</i> , ed. I. Bekker. Berolini 1814-1821
<i>Anecd. Ox.</i>	<i>Anecdota graeca e codicis manuscriptis bibliothecarum oxoniensium</i> descripsit J.A. Cramer. Oxonii 1835 (= Amsterdam 1963)
Antim. Col.	<i>Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae</i> , ed. B. Wyss. Berolini 1936 <i>Antimachus of Colophon</i> , ed. V.J. Matthews. Leiden - New York - Köln 1996 (<i>Mnem. suppl.</i> 155)
Apoll. Dysc. <i>Pron.</i>	<i>Apollonii Dyscoli Quae supersunt</i> , recc. R. Schneider, G. Uhlig, v. 1.1. Lipsiae 1878 (= Hildesheim - New York 1979 - GG 2.1)
Ap. Soph.	<i>Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum</i> , ed. I. Bekker. Berolini 1833 (= Hildesheim 1967)
Apostolius	cf. <i>CPG</i>

164 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Archil.	Archilocus, <i>Fragmenta</i> , ed. J. Tarditi. Romae 1968
Aristarch.	<i>De Aristarchi studiis homericis</i> , scripsit K. Lehrs. Leipzig 1882 ³ (= Hildesheim 1964)
Aristid. <i>Or.</i> 3	Aelii Aristidis Oratio III: <i>P. Aelii Aristidis quae exstant omnia</i> , ed. W. Lenz, C.A. Behr. Lugduni Batavorum 1976-80, 293-524
Aristid. <i>Or.</i> 22	Aelii Aristidis Oratio XXII: <i>Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia</i> , v. 2, 28-31, ed. B. Keil. Berolini 1898
Aristonic. <i>Iliad.</i>	Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος <i>reliquiae emendatiores</i> , ed. L. Friedlaender. Gottingae 1853
Aristonic. <i>Odyss.</i>	Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ὀδυσσεΐας <i>reliquiae emendatiores</i> , ed. O. Carnuth. Lipsiae 1869
Ar. Byz.	Aristophanis Byzantii <i>Fragmenta</i> , ed. W.J. Slater. Berlin-New York 1987
Aristoph.	Aristophanis <i>Comoediae</i> , rec. F.W. Hall. Oxonii 1906-1907
Arist. <i>Et. Eudem.</i>	Aristotelis <i>Ethica Eudemia</i> , ed. F. Susemihl. Leipzig 1884
Arist. <i>Pol.</i>	Aristotelis <i>Politica</i> , rec. O. Immisch. Lipsiae 1929
Arist. <i>Rhet.</i>	Aristotelis <i>Ars rhetorica</i> , rec. D.W. Ross. Oxonii 1959
Arist. <i>fr.</i>	Aristotelis <i>qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta</i> , ed. V. Rose. Lipsiae 1886 ³
	Aristotelis <i>Opera</i> , vol. 3: <i>Librorum deperditorum fragmenta</i> , ed. O. Gigon. Berlin-New York, 1987
Aristox.	Aristoxeni <i>Elementa harmonica</i> , rec. R. da Rios. Romae 1954
Ath. <i>Deipn.</i>	Athenaeus, <i>Deipnosophistarum Libri XV</i> , ed. G. Kaibel. Stuttgartiae 1887-90 [BT]
Ath. <i>Epit.</i>	<i>Athenaei Deipnosophistarum Epitome</i> , ed. S.P. Peppink, vol. 2.2. (libri IX-XIV). Leiden 1939
Aul. Gell. <i>N.A.</i>	Auli Gellii <i>Noctes Atticae</i> , rec. P.K. Marshall. Oxonii 1990 ²
Babrius	Babrii <i>Mythiambi Aesopaei</i> , edd. M.J. Luzzatto, A. La Penna. Leipzig 1986
Biograph.	ΒΙΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ. <i>Vitarum scriptores graeci minores</i> , ed. A. Westermann. Braunschweig 1845
Callimachus	<i>Callimachus</i> , ed. R. Pfeiffer, 2 voll. Oxonii 1949-53
Chamaeleon Koepke	<i>De Chamaeleontis Heracleotae vita librorumque reliquiis disputavit, quaestiones de ratione, quam in enarrandis poetis secutus esset Peripateticus</i> , habuit E. Koepke. Berolini 1856
Scorza	G. Scorza, "Il peripatetico Cameleonte," <i>RIGI</i> 18 (1934) 1-48
Steffen	Chamaeleontis <i>Fragmenta</i> , edidit et illustravit V. Steffen. Varsoviae 1964
Wehrli	<i>Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes</i> , (Die Schule des Aristoteles, Band IX), hrsg. v. F. Wehrli. Basel - Stuttgart 1969 ²

Giordano ¹	Chamaeleontis Heracleotae <i>fragmenta</i> , edidit commentarioque instruxit D. Giordano. Bologna 1978
Giordano ²	Chamaeleontis Heracleotae <i>fragmenta</i> , iteratis curis commentarioque instruxit D. Giordano. Bologna 1990
Choerob.	Georgii Choerobosci <i>Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini Canones isagogicos de flexione nominum</i> , ed. A. Hilgard. Leipzig 1894 (GG 4.1, pp. 101-417)
Cic. <i>de fin.</i>	M. Tullius Cicero, <i>De finibus bonorum et malorum</i> : M. Tullius Cicero, <i>Scripta quae manserunt omnia</i> , fasc. 43, rec. C. Moreschini. Monachii et Lipsiae 2002
Cic. <i>De orat.</i>	M. Tulli Ciceronis <i>De oratore</i> , ed. K.F. Kumaniecki. Leipzig 1969
Clem. <i>Strom.</i>	Clemens Alexandrinus, <i>Stromata</i> , hrsg. von O. Stählin. Leipzig 1906-1909
Con. <i>Narrat.</i>	<i>The narratives of Konon</i> , ed. M. Kenneth Brown. München-Leipzig 2002
Crates Mall.	Cratete di Mallo, <i>I frammenti</i> , ed. M. Broggiato. Roma 2006.
Dem. Phal.	Demetrius of Phalerum, <i>Text, Translation and Discussion</i> , ed. by. W.W. Fortenbaugh, E. Schütrumpf. New Brunswick - London 2000 (RUSCH IX)
Diehl	<i>Anthologia lyrica graeca</i> , ed. E. Diehl, editio altera. Lipsiae 1936-1942
Didym.	<i>Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia</i> , coll. et disp. M. Schmidt. Lipsiae 1854 A. Ludwich, <i>Aristarchs homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos</i> . Leipzig 1885 (= Hildesheim 1971)
Dio. Chrys. <i>Or.</i>	<i>Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia</i> , 2 voll., ed. J. von Arnim. Berlin 1893-96
Dio. Halic. <i>De comp. verb.</i>	Dionysii Halicarnasei <i>De compositione verborum</i> : Dionysii Halicarnasei <i>Opuscula</i> , v. 2, 3-143, ed. H. Usener, L. Radermacher. Leipzig 1899-1929
Dio. Halic. <i>De Demosth.</i>	Dionysii Halicarnasei <i>De Demosthene</i> : Dionysii Halicarnasei <i>Opuscula</i> , v. 1, 127-252, ed. H. Usener, L. Radermacher. Leipzig 1899-1929
Dio. Halic. <i>De imit.</i>	Dionysii Halicarnasei <i>De imitatione</i> : Dionysii Halicarnasei <i>Opuscula</i> , v. 2, 197-217, edd. H. Usener, L. Radermacher. Leipzig 1899-1929
Diod. Sic.	Diodori <i>Bibliotheca historica</i> , edd. F. Vogel, K.T. Fischer. Lipsiae 1888-1906
Diog. Laert.	Diogenes Laertius, <i>Vitae philosophorum</i> , ed. M. Marcovich. Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae 1999-2000
Diogenian. Drachmann	<i>cf. CPG</i> <i>cf. Schol. Pind.</i>

166 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Dithyr. *Ditirambografi. Testimonianze e frammenti*, a c. di C. Del Grande. Napoli 1946
- Epim. Hom.* *Epimerismi Homerici, Pars altera Epimerismos continens qui ordine alphabetico traditi sunt*, ed. A.R. Dyck. Berlin-New York 1995
- Eratosthenes *Eratosthenica*, composuit G. Bernhardt. Berlin 1822
- Et.Gen.* *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum, Symeonis Etymologicum una cum Magna Grammatica, Etymologicum Magnum Auctum*, edd. F. Lasserre, N. Livadaras, I (α-ἀμωσγέπως), Romae 1976; II (ἀνά-βώτορες). Ἐκδόσεις Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Παρνασσός [1995]
- Et.Gen. A* ms. Vat. gr. 1818
- Et.M.* *Etymologicon Magnum*, ad codd. mss. rec. et notis variorum instr. T. Gaisford. Oxonii 1848 (= Amsterdam 1967)
- Eust. *Iliad.* Eustatii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editi, cur. M. Van der Valk. Leiden 1971-1987
- Eust. *Odyss.* Eustatii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, ad fidem codicis Romani, ed. G. Stallbaum. Leipzig 1825
- Eust. *Vita Pindari* Eustathios von Thessalonike, *Prooimion zum Pindarkommentar*, einl., krit. Text, Ind., b.v. A. Kambylis. Göttingen 1991
- Heracl. Pont. *Heraclides Pontikos = SA v. 7*, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel-Stuttgart 1969²
- Heraclides of Pontus*, Text, Translation and Discussion, ed. by E. Schütrumpf. New Brunswick - London 2009 (RUSCH XV)
- Hermesian. Hermesianax: *Collectanea Alexandrina*, ed. I.U. Powell, pp. 96-106. Oxonii 1925
- Hellenistic collection. Philitas, Alexandre of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Parthenius*, ed. J.L. Lightfoot. Cambridge, Mass. - London 2009
- Hermippus *Hermippos = SA suppl. 1*, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel - Stuttgart 1974
- cf. *FGrHist.* cont.
- Hermog. *Progymn.* Hermogenis *Opera*, 1-27 ed. H. Rabe. Lipsiae 1913
- Herod. Herodoti *Historiae*, ed. E. Rosén. Leipzig 1987-1997
- Hesiod. Hesiod, *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, ed. by G.W. Most. Cambridge, Mass. - London 2006
- Hesiodi Carmina*, rec. F. Jacoby, v. 1, *Theogonia*. Berolini 1930
- Fragmenta hesiodea*, edd. R. Merkelbach, M.L. West. Oxonii 1967
- Hesych. Hesychii Alexandrini *Lexicon*, rec. M. Schmidt. Ienae 1858-68 [= 1965]

	Hesychii Alexandrini <i>Lexicon</i> , litterae A-Ξ, rec. K. Latte. Hauniae 1953-66
	Hesychii Alexandrini <i>Lexicon</i> , litterae Π-Ω, rec. P.A. Hansen. Berlin - New York, 2005-2009
Hieronym.	<i>Hieronymus of Rhodes: Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes. Text Translation and Discussion</i> , ed. by W.W. Fortenbaugh, S. White. New Brunswick - London 2004, (RUSCH XII)
Himerius	Himerii <i>Declamationes et orationes</i> , rec. A. Colonna. Romae 1951
Hippolitus	Hippolitus, <i>Refutatio omnium haeresium</i> : Hippolitus, <i>Werke</i> , v. 3, hrsg. von P. Wendland. Leipzig 1916 (GCS 26)
Irenaeus <i>Adv. haereses</i>	Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis <i>Libros quinque contra haereses</i> , ed. W. Wigan Harvey. Cantabrigiae 1857
Ion Chius	<i>Ionis Chii Testimonia et fragmenta</i> , ed. A. Leurini. Roma 1992
Isocrates	Isocratis <i>Helenaе encomium</i> : Isocrate, <i>Discours</i> , ed. G. Matthieu, E. Brémond. Paris 1929 (= 1963)
Lact. <i>Div. inst.</i>	L. Caelius Firmianus Lactantius, <i>Divinarum institutionum libri septem</i> , v. 1, edd. E. Heck, A. Wlosok. Monachii et Lipsiae 2005
Lasus	Laso di Ermione, <i>Testimonanze e frammenti</i> , testo traduzione e commento di G.F. Brussich. Pisa 2002
Longinus rh.	Longini Rhetoris <i>Ars rethorica: Rhetores graeci</i> , ex recognitione L. Spengel, vol. 1.2 ed. C. Hammer, pp. 179-207. Lipsiae 1894
Lucian. <i>Dem. enc.</i>	Luciani <i>Demosthenis encomium</i> : Lucian, v. 7, with an english translation of M.D. Macleod. Cambridge, Mass.-London 1967
Men. <i>Asp.</i>	Menander, <i>Le bouclier</i> , texte établi et traduit par J.-M. Jacques. Paris 1998
Mimn.	Mimnermus: <i>Poetarum elegiacorum testimonia et fragmenta</i> , edd. B. Gentili, C. Prato, v. 1, pp. 39-61. Leipzig 1988 A. Allen, <i>The fragments of Mimnermus. Text and Commentary</i> . Stuttgart 1993
Mnesitheus	Mnesitheus Atheniensis, <i>Fragmenta</i> : Mnésithée et Dieuchès, ed. J. Bertier. Leiden 1972 (<i>Philosophia Antiqua</i> 20)
Oenom. Gad.	J. Hammerstaedt, <i>Die Orakelkritik des Kynikers Oenomaus</i> . Frankfurt am Main 1988 (Athenäum Monografien: Altertumwissenschaft, Bd. 188)
Pausanias	Pausaniae <i>Graeciae descriptio</i> , ed. M.H. Rocha Pereira. Leipzig 1977

168 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Paus. Att.	Pausaniae Atticistae Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων συναγωγή: <i>Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika</i> , 153-221, ed. H. Erbse. Berlin 1950
Petr. Satyr.	Petronius, <i>Satyricon reliquiae</i> , ed. K Müller. Stuttgartardiae et Lipsiae 1995
Phld. De mus.	Philodème de Gadara, <i>Sur la musique. Livre IV</i> , texte établi, traduit et annoté par D. Delattre. Paris 2007 Philodemi <i>de musica quae exstant</i> , ed. I. Kemke. Lipsiae 1884 Philodemus <i>über die Musik IV. Buch</i> , Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar von A.J. Neubecker. Napoli 1986 G.M. Rispoli, <i>Il primo libro del περὶ μουσικῆς di Filodemo: Ricerche sui papiri ercolanesi</i> , 23-286, a cura di F. Sbordone. Napoli 1968
Philostr.	Philostrati maioris <i>Images</i> , Ottonis Benndorfii et Caroli Schenkelii consilio et opera adiuti recenserunt Seminariorum Vindobonensium Sodales. Lipsiae 1893
Philostr. Vita Apoll.	Philostratus, <i>The life of Apollonius of Tyana</i> , ed. C.P. Jones. Cambridge, Mass. - London 2005
Phocylid.	Phocylides: <i>Poetarum elegiacorum testimonia et fragmenta</i> , ed. B. Gentili, C. Prato, v. 1, pp. 130-40. Leipzig 1988
Phot. Bibl.	Photius, <i>Bibliothèque</i> , texte établi et traduit par R. Henry, v. 4 (“codices” 223-229). Paris 1965
Phot. Lex.	Photii Patriarcae <i>Lexicon</i> , ed. Ch. Theodoridis, Berlin - New York 1982-1998 Photii Patriarcae <i>Lexicon</i> , rec., adn. instr. et prol. add. S.A. Naber. Leidae 1864-1865
Pindarus	Pindari <i>Carmina cum fragmentis</i> , post B. Snell ed. H. Mähler. Leipzig 1975-1984
Plat. Leg.	Platonis <i>Leges: Platonis Opera</i> , v. 5, rec. O. Burnet. Oxonii 1907
Plat. Phaedr.	Platonis <i>Phaedrus: Platonis Opera</i> , v. 2, rec. O. Burnet. Oxonii 1901
Plin. NH	C. Plini Secundi <i>Naturalis Historiae libri XXXVII</i> , ed. C. Mayhoff. Stutytgardiae et Lipsiae 1906 (= 1996)
Plut. De prof. in virt.	Plutarchi <i>Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus: Plutarchi Moralia</i> , v. 1, 149-71, edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974
Plut. De exilio	Plutarchi <i>De exilio: Plutarchi Moralia</i> , v. 3, 512-32, edd. W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking. Leipzig 1929
Plut. Fragm.	Plutarchi <i>Fragmenta: Plutarchi Moralia</i> , v. 7, rec. et em. F.H. Sandbach. Lipsiae 1967
Plut. QC	Plutarchi <i>Quaestiones convivales: Plutarchi Moralia</i> , v. 4, rec. et em. C. Hubert. Lipsiae 1938
[Plut.] de mus.	Plutarchi <i>De musica: Plutarchi Moralia</i> , v. 6.3, edd. K. Ziegler, M. Pohlenz. Leipzig 1953

- [Plut.] *de Hom. vit. et poe.* [Plutarchi] *De Homeri vita et poesi*: Plutarchi Chaeronensis *Moralia*, recognovit G.N. Bernardakis, v. 7, pp. 329-462. Lipsiae 1896
- [Plut.] *Vit. dec. or.* Plutarchus, *Vitae decem oratorum*: in Plutarchi *Moralia*, v. 5.2.1, 1-49, ed. J. Mau. Leipzig 1971
- Polemon Polemonis Periegetae *Fragmenta*, coll. L. Preller. Leipzig 1838
- Quintil. M.F. Quintiliani *Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim*, rec. M. Winterbottom. Oxonii 1970
- Sappho Sappho et Alcaeus, *Fragmenta*, ed. E.-M. Voigt. Amsterdam 1971
- Saffo e Alceo, *Testimonianze e frammenti*, 2 voll., ed. C. Gallavotti. Napoli 1956-1957²
- Schol. Aesch. *Prom.* *The older scholia on the Prometheus bound*, ed. by O.J. Herington. Lugduni Batavorum 1972
- Schol. Aristid. *Aristides*, v. 3, ex recensione Gui. Dindorfii. Lipsiae 1829
- Schol. Aristoph. *Scholia in Aristophanem*, edidit edendave curavit W.J. Koster. *Scholia vetera in Nubes*, 1.3.1, ed. D. Holwerda. Groningen 1977; *Scholia recentiores in Nubes*, 1.3.2, ed. W.J. Koster. Groningen 1974; *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Pacem*, 2.2, ed. D. Holwerda. Groningen 1982; *Jo. Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem, Commentarium in Nubes*, 4.2, ed. D. Holwerda, Groningen 1977; *Scholia recentiores in Nubes*, 3.2, ed. W.J. Koster. Groningen 1974
- Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, ed. F. Dübner. Parisiis 1877 (= Hildesheim 1969)
- Schol. Eur. *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis tragoedias*, ed. G. Dindorfius, 1-4. Oxonii 1863
- Schol. Hom. *Iliad.* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem: scholia vetera*, 7 voll., recensuit H. Erbse. Berolini 1969-1971
- Schol. D Hom. *Iliad.* *Scholia D in Iliadem*, secundum codices manuscriptos ed. H. van Thiel. Proecdosis 2000
- Schol. Hom. *Iliad. genav.* *Les Scholies Genevoises de l'Iliade*, ed. J. Nicole. Geneve und Basel 1891 (= Hildesheim 1966)
- Schol. Hom. *Odyss.* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odyseam*, ed. G. Dindorf. Oxonii 1855
- Scholia Graeca in Odyseam*, ed. F. Pontani, v. 1, scholia ad libros α - β . Roma 2007
- Schol. Lycophr. *Scholia vetera et paraphrases in Lycophronis Alexandram*, ed. P.A.M. Leone. Galatina 2002
- Schol. Pind. *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, 3 voll., ed. A.B. Drachmann. Lipsiae 1903-1927
- Schol. Plat. *Scholia graeca in Platonem*, ed. D. Cufalo. Roma 2007
- Servius Servii Grammatici *qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina Commentarii*, recc. G. Thilo, H. Hagen. Lipsiae 1878-1887

170 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Sext. Emp.	Sexti Empirici <i>Adversus mathematicos</i> , ed. J. Mau. Lipsiae 1954
Simonides	Simonides lyricus, <i>Testimonia und Fragmente</i> , Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar, hrsg. v. O. Poltera. Basel 2008
Stob. <i>Anth.</i>	Ioannis Stobaei <i>Anthologium</i> , 5 voll. edd. C. Wachsmuth, O. Hense. Berolini 1884-1912
Strabo	Strabons <i>Geographika</i> , 10 voll., hrsg. v. S. Radt. Göttingen 2002-11
Strato	Strato of Lampsacus. <i>Text, Translation, and Discussion</i> , ed. by M.-L. Desclos, W.W. Fortenbaugh, New Brunswick - London 2011 (RUSCH XVI)
<i>Sud.lex.</i>	Suidae <i>Lexicon</i> , ed. A. Adler. Stuttgartiae 1928 [= 1989].
Tatianus	Tatiani <i>Oratio ad Graecos</i> , ed. by M. Marcovich. Berlin - New York 1995
Thphr.	cf. FHS&G
Thphr. <i>Eth.</i>	<i>Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts</i> , hrsg. v. W.W. Fortenbaugh. Amsterdam 1984
Theon Smyrnaeus	Theonis Smyrnaei philosophi platonici <i>Expositio rerum mathematicarum ad legendum Platonem utilium</i> , ed. E. Hiller. Lipsiae 1878
Tzetzes <i>Hist.</i>	Ioannis Tzetzae <i>Historiae</i> , rec. P.A.M. Leone. Napoli 1968
Zenobius	cf. CPG
Zenob. <i>Ath.</i>	E. Miller, <i>Melanges de littérature grecque</i> , 349-84. Paris 1868
Zenodotus	<i>De Zenodoti studiis homericis</i> , scripsit H. Duentzer. Gottingae 1848
Ps.-Zon. <i>lex.</i>	Ioannis Zonarae <i>Lexicon</i> , ed. J.A.H. Tittmann. Leipzig 1808

(c) Modern Works and Authors

Ameling	<i>The Inscriptions of Heraclea Pontica</i> , ed. by L. Jonnes, with a <i>Prosopographia Heracleotica</i> by W. Ameling. Bonn 1994
Arrighetti ¹	G. Arrighetti, "Il POxy XIII 1611: alcuni problemi di erudizione antica," <i>SCO</i> 17 (1968), pp. 76-98
Arrighetti ²	G. Arrighetti, "Fra erudizione e biografia," <i>SCO</i> 26 (1977), pp. 13-67
Arrighetti ³	G. Arrighetti, "Stesicoro, l'ispirazione divina e la poetica della verità," in ΑΠΑΡΧΑΙ. <i>Nuove ricerche e studi sulla Magna Grecia e la Sicilia antica in onore di Paolo Enrico Arias</i> . Pisa 1982, pp. 105-111
Arrighetti ⁴	G. Arrighetti <i>Poeti eruditi e biografi. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura</i> . Pisa 1987
Arrighetti ⁵	G. Arrighetti, "Riflessione sulla letteratura e biografia presso i Greci," in <i>La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine</i> , ed. F. Montanari. Vandouvres - Genève 1994

- Arrighetti⁶ G. Arrighetti, “Cameleonte peripatetico e gli studi sulla biografia greca,” in *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli*, a c. di P. Arduini, S. Audano et al. Roma 2008
- Bowra C.M. Bowra, *Greek lyric poetry from Alcman to Simonides*, second revised edition. Oxford 1961 [*La lirica greca da Alcmane a Simonide*, a c. di G. Lanata. Firenze 1973]
- Blank “Diogenes of Babylon and the κριτικοί in Philodemus: a preliminary suggestion,” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 24 (1994), pp. 55-62
- Bravi L. Bravi, *Gli epigrammi di Simonide e le vie della tradizione*. Roma 2006
- Budin S.L. Budin, “Simonides’ Corinthian Epigram,” *CPh* 103 (2008), pp. 335-353
- Degani-Burzacchini E. Degani, G. Burzacchini, *Lirici Greci*. Bologna, 2005²
- Delattre, ed. see Phld. *De mus.*
- Delattre¹ “Speusippe, Diogène de Babylone et Philodème,” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 23 (1993), pp. 67-86
- Delattre² “La conclusion des *Commentaires sur la musique* de Philodème (Livre IV, col. 151-152),” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 29 (1999), pp. 31-36
- Di Gregorio L. Di Gregorio, “L’Hermes di Eratostene,” *Aevum* 84 (2010), pp. 69-144
- Di Benedetto V. Di Benedetto, “Sulla biografia di Saffo,” *SCO* 32 (1982), pp. 217-230
- Ercoles M. Ercoles, *Stesicoro: testimonianze. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento*, 2008, Phd dissertation (XX ciclo) discussed at Università degli Studi di Bologna, Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Medioevale, available online at <http://amsdottorato.cib.unibo.it/826/>
- Gallo¹ I. Gallo, *Una nuova biografia di Pindaro*. Salerno, 1968
- Gallo² I. Gallo, “Un nuovo frammento di Cameleonte e il problema della biografia ‘grammaticale’ alessandrina,” *Vichiana* 2 (1973), pp. 241-246
- Gallo³ I. Gallo, *Ricerche sul teatro greco*. Napoli 1992
- Gentili B. Gentili, *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica*. Roma-Bari 1984
- Giordano¹ and Giordano² see Chamaeleon
- Giangrande G. Giangrande, “Two Passages of Chamaileon and a Fragment of Aristotle,” *Epistimoniki epetiris tis filosofikis scholis tou panepistimiou Athinon* 25 (1974-1977). Athinai 1978
- Huffmann C.A. Huffmann, *Archytas of Tarentum. Pythagorean, Philosopher and Mathematician King*. Cambridge 2005
- Gorman R.J.-V. Gorman, “The *Tryphê* of Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus,” *JHS* 127 (2007), pp. 38-60

172 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Gostoli A. Gostoli, "Stesicoro e la tradizione citarodica," *QUCC* 59 (1998) pp. 145-152
- Gottschalk H.B. Gottschalk, *Heraclides of Pontus*. Oxford 1980
- Holwerda D. Holwerda, "De novo Chamaeleontis studiorum testimonio," *Mnemosyne* s. IV vol. V.3 (1952), pp. 228-231
- Jackson S. Jackson, *Istrus the Callimachean*. Amsterdam 2000
- Kaibel G. Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena περὶ κωμωδίας," Berlin 1898 (*Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, N.F. 2,4.), pp. 53-64
- Kannicht Euripides, *Helena*, hrsg. v. R. Kannicht. Heidelberg 1969
- Kelly A. Kelly, "Stesichoros and Helen," *MH* 64 (2007), pp. 1-21
- Koepke see Chamaeleon
- Lanata G. Lanata, *Poetica pre-platonica. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Firenze 1963
- Lelli *I proverbi Greci. Le raccolte di Zenobio e Diogeniano*, a c. di E. Lelli. Soveria Mannelli (Catanzaro) 2007
- Leo F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form*. Leipzig 1901
- Leone P. Leone, "La palinodia di Stesicoro," *AFLN* 11 (1964-1968), pp. 5-28
- Lorenzoni¹ A. Lorenzoni, "Chamael. fragm. novum," *MCr* 13-14 (1978), pp. 321-22
- Lorenzoni² A. Lorenzoni, "Chamaeleontea," *QUCC* n.s. 6 (1980), 137-149
- Martano "Note di esegesi anacreontea antica: P.Oxy. 3722 e Anacreonte, fr. 82 Gentili," *Aegyptus* 88 (2008), pp. 25-35
- Marzullo B. Marzullo, "Alcman fr. 59 P.," *Helikon* 4 (1964), pp. 297-301
- Matelli¹ E. Matelli, "Gli Aesopica di Demetrio del Falero," in *Demetrius of Phalerum. Text, translation and discussion*, ed. by E. Schütrumpf, W.W. Fortenbaugh. New Brunswick - London 2000, pp. 413-447
- Matelli² E. Matelli, "Musicoterapia e catarsi in Teofrasto," *BICS* 47 (2004), pp. 153-174
- Molfino M. Molfino, "Lusit Anacreon. Esegesi anacreontea antica in P.Oxy. 3722," *Maia* 50 (1998), 317-328
- Momigliano A. Momigliano, *Lo sviluppo della biografia greca*. Torino 1974
- Montanari¹ F. Montanari, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the *Ekdosis* of Homer," in *Editing Texts – Texte edieren*, ed. by G.W. Most. Göttingen 1998, pp. 1-21
- Montanari² F. Montanari, "Ripensamenti di Aristarco sul testo omerico e il problema della seconda *ekdosis*," in *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*, a c. di M. Cannatà Fera, S. Grandolini. Napoli 2000, pp. 479-486

- Montanari³ F. Montanari, "Alexandrian Homeric Philology. The Form of the *Ekdosis* and the *Variae Lectiones*," in *Epea Pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag*, hrsg. v. M. Reichel, A. Rengakos. Stuttgart 2002, pp. 119-135
- Montanari⁴ F. Montanari, "La filologia omerica antica e la storia del testo omerico," in *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*, hrsg. v. A. Bierl, A. Schmitt, A. Willi. Leipzig 2004. pp. 127-143
- Nesselrath H.-G. Nesselrath, *Die Attische mittlere Komödie*. Berlin - New York 1990
- Pfeiffer R. Pfeiffer, *History of classical scholarship from the beginnings to the end of hellenistic age*, v. 1. Oxford 1968
- Pickard-Cambridge A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Oxford 1968²
- Podlecki A.J. Podlecki, "The Peripatetics as Literary critics," *Phoenix* 23 (1969), pp. 114-137
- Pontani F.M. Pontani, *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*. Roma 2005
- Privitera G.A. Privitera, *Laso di Ermione nella cultura ateniese e nella tradizione storiografica*. Roma 1965
- Reitzenstein R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Alexandrinischen Dichtung*. Giessen 1893
- Rispoli¹ see Phild. *De mus.*
- Rispoli² "Teoria e storia della musica in Filodemo," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 30 (2000), pp. 89-102
- Rispoli³ "Filosofi e filosofia nel *De musica* di Filodemo," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 33 (2003), pp. 175-188
- Rostagni A. Rostagni, in *RFIC* 56 (1928), pp. 590-591
- Saprykin S. Saprykin, *Heracleia Pontica and Tauric Chersonesus Before Roman Domination /VI-I Centuries B.C.* Amsterdam 1997
- Scholl F. Scholl, *De locis nonnullis ad Aeschlyli vitam et ad historiam tragoediae Graecae pertinentibus epistula*. Ienae 1876
- Schorn¹ S. Schorn, "Chamaeleon-Studien," in *Dona sunt pulchra. Festschrift für Rudolph Rieks*, ed. K. Hermann, K. Geus, U. Fehn, E. Porsch. Oberhaid 2008
- Schorn² S. Schorn, "Chamaileon: Biography and Literature *Peri tou deina*," in this volume
- Scorza see Chamaeleon
- Sgobbi A. Sgobbi, "Stesich. fr. 274 Davies: un inno di Stesicoro ad Atena?," *Acme* 59 (2006), pp. 284-299
- Steffen see Chamaeleon
- Suess W. Suess, "Die Ältere Dionys als Tragiker," *RhM* 109 (1966), pp. 299-318

174 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Susemihl F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, 2 voll. Leipzig 1891-92

Ucciardello G. Ucciardello, *Dionysius [1]*, LGGA, http://www.lgga.unige.itschedePDF200206271412570.Dionysius_1_Olyntius.pdf

Wehrli¹ F. Wehrli, *Chamaileon*, *RE* Suppl. XI, Stuttgart 1968, coll. 368-72

Wehrli² see Chamaeleon

Wendling E. Wendling, *Chamaileon* 1, *RE* III.2, Stuttgart - Weimar 1899, coll. 2103-4

West M. L. West, "P. Oxy. 3722 (Commentary on Anacreon): marginalia," *ZPE* 76 (1989), pp. 1-2

West, S. S. West, "Proteus in Stesichorus' Palinode," *ZPE* 47 (1982), pp. 6-10

Wilamowitz¹ U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin 1913

Wilamowitz² U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Berlin 1924

Woodbury L. Woodbury, "Helen and the Palinode," *Phoenix* 21 (1967), pp. 157-176

Zecchini G. Zecchini, *La cultura storica di Ateneo*. Milano 1989

(d) Other Abbreviations

a. Chr.	ante Christum natum	fr.	fragmentum
add.	addidit, addiderunt	le.	lemma
adn.	adnotatio	leg.	legit
an.	anonymus	marg.	(in) margine
app.	apparatus criticus	om.	omisit, omiserunt
cett.	ceteri	p. Chr.	post Christum natum
cf.	confer	prob.	probavit, probaverunt
codd.	codices	rec.	recepit
col.	columna	rest.	restituit
coll.	conlato, conlatis	s.	saeculo
coni.	coniecit, coniecerunt	secl.	seclisit
corr.	correxerunt	suad.	suadenter
del.	delevit	superscr.	superscripsit
div.	divisit	suppl.	supplevit, suppleverunt
dub.	dubitanter	s.v.	sub voce
e.g.	exempli gratia	tempt.	temptavit
ed. pr.	editio princeps	trans.	transtulit
edd.	editores	v.l.	varia lectio
em.	emendavit		

(e) Symbols used in the Apparatus

⟨α⟩	littera addita vel suppleta
[α]	littera deleta
†	locum nondum sanatum
A	manus codicis cuiusdam prima
A ²	manus codicis cuiusdam posterior
<i>in papyris:</i>	
[α]	littera ab editore suppleta
{α}	littera ab editore deleta
⌈α⌋	littera a librario deleta
α	littera mutila vel dubia
. .	reliquiae totidem litterarum
[.]	littera deperdita
⌊ ⌋	littera restituta a loco alterius scriptoris
⌈ ⌋	littera ab editore correcta
	notatio duorum fragmentorum connexionis

I. VITA

Testimonium de legatione ad Seleucum

1a Memnon Heracleotes, *De Heraclea* (Phot. *Biblioth.* 226a, 9-25 vol. IV, p. 59. 9-25 Henry = *FGrHist* 434 F 7, vol. IIIa, p. 343).

1w ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Σέλευκος Ἀφροδίσιον πέμπει διοικητὴν εἰς
 τε τὰς ἐν Φρυγίᾳ πόλεις καὶ τὰς ὑπερκειμένας τοῦ Πόντου.
 ὁ δέ, διαπραξάμενος ἃ ἐβούλετο καὶ ἐπανιών, τῶν μὲν
 ἄλλων πόλεων ἐν ἐπαίνοις ἦν, Ἡρακλεώτων δὲ κατηγορεῖ
 μὴ εὖνοικῶς ἔχειν τοῖς τοῦ Σελεύκου πράγμασιν· ὑφ' οὗ 5
 Σέλευκος παροξυνθεὶς τοὺς τε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικομένους
 πρέσβεις ἀπειλητικοῖς ἐξεφαύλιζε λόγοις καὶ κατέπληττεν,
 ἐνὸς τοῦ Χαμαιλέοντος οὐδὲν ὀρρωδήσαντος τὰς ἀπειλάς,
 ἀλλὰ φαμένου “Ἡρακλῆς κάρρων, Σέλευκε” (κάρρων δὲ ὁ
 ἰσχυρότερος παρὰ Δωριεῦσιν). ὁ δ' οὖν Σέλευκος τὸ μὲν 10
 ῥηθὲν οὐ συνῆκεν, ὀργῆς δ' ὥς εἶχε καὶ ἀπετρέπετο.
 τοῖς δὲ οὔτε τὸ ἀναχωρεῖν οἴκαδε οὔτε τὸ προσμένειν
 λυσιτελὲς ἐδόκει. ταῦτα δὲ Ἡρακλεῶται πυθόμενοι τὰ
 τε ἄλλα παρεσκευάζοντο καὶ συμμάχους ἤθροιζον, πρὸς
 τε Μιθριδάτην τὸν Πόντου βασιλέα διαπρεσβευόμενοι καὶ 15
 πρὸς Βυζαντίους καὶ Καλχηδονίους.

9 cf. *Sophr. PCG F59 K-A* (= 59 Kaibel = 59 Hordern) ex *Apoll. Dysc. pron. p. 74.21*: ... “Ἡρακλῆς τεοῦς κάρρων ἦς”, cf. *etiam Et.gen. A s.v. κάρρων*

9 Ἡρακλῆς A²: Ἡρακλεῖς A M κάρρων *Stephanus*: καρῶν *codd.* 16
 Καλχηδονίους A M: Χαλκηδονίους A² v.l.

I. LIFE

Testimony on an Embassy to Seleucus

- 1a** Memnon of Heraclea, *On Heraclea*, in Photius, *Library* 226a9-25

At this time¹ Seleucus sends Aphrodisius² as administrator to the cities in Phrygia and to those lying beyond Pontus. And the administrator, when he had accomplished what he wanted and returned, had praises for the other cities, but he criticized the Heracleots for not being good-willed toward the affairs of Seleucus. Seleucus was angered by this and disparaged the ambassadors who came to him with threatening words and frightened them. Chamaeleon³ alone did not fear the threats but said, “Heracles (is) *karrôn*, Seleucus”⁴ (*karrôn* meaning “the stronger” among the Dorians). However, Seleucus did not understand what was said and withheld his anger and turned away. To the Heracleot ambassadors it did not seem worthwhile either to return home or to remain longer. When the Heracleots heard these things, they made other preparations, but in particular they gathered allies and sent ambassadors to Mithridates king of Pontus and to the Byzantines and Chalchedonians.

From Memnon of Heraclea Pontica, historian of Heraclea from the 2nd century BC, known from codex 224 of Photius’ *Library*. See *FrGHist* IIIb, *Komm.*, pp. 267-71.

¹ After the battle of Curupedium (summer of 281 BC) and the defeat and death of Lysimachus, the Heracleots, who until then had been ruled by local tyrants and had a degree of autonomy (see Saprykin, pp. 131ff.), sent an embassy to the new king, Seleucus, who died a few months later (January 280 BC).

² On Aphrodisius, administrator of Seleucus’ kingdom, see *RE* I.2, s.v. “Aphrodisius” (1), col. 2728 (Kirchner).

³ The identification of the Chamaeleon quoted here with the philosopher of the Peripatos is not unanimous. Koepke, p. 4, Kaibel, p. 53, Wilamowitz², p. 49 n. 2, Jacoby, IIIb, *Komm.*, p. 274, Steffen p. 8, Giordano², pp. 111-12 and Wehrli², p. 69 (see also Wehrli¹, coll. 368-69), have all favored it, but Scorza, p. 2, and Wendling, col. 2103, have raised doubts. Chamaeleon’s chronology and the absence of other famous people with the same name (see Ameling, p.

178 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Chamaeleon et Heraclides Ponticus eadem aetate vixerunt

1b Cf. fr. **16**

NOMEN

1c Chamaeleon dicitur Heracleota

1. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 4.84 184d = **4**
2. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 8.20 338d = **33**
3. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.16 374a = **46**
4. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.29 427b = **11**
5. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.84 456c = **37**
6. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11.4 461a = **10**
7. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.26 170.3= **14**

1d Chamaeleon dicitur Ponticus

1. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 6.105 273c = **9**
2. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.42 390a = **26**
3. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.72 406e = **47**
4. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.35 430a = **13**
5. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 12.46 533e = **39**
6. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.18 624a = **5**
7. Anonymus, *De Sapphone*, *POxy.* 15 1800, fr. 1 coll. 1-2 = **29**

165) seem to confirm the hypothesis that it is he (see **16** n. 2). He must indeed have been a leading exponent of the cultural life of Heraclea and, as such, was entitled to take part in the embassy (*RE* suppl. XIII, s.v. “Presbeia”, coll. 590-96 [D. Kienast]). It would also not be surprising to hear from the mouth of a character as vibrant and cultured as Chamaeleon a proverbial expression such as Sophron’s. Find a similar story in the testimony about the embassy of Demetrius of Phalerum to Craterus in 322 BC, after the battle of Crannon (fr. 12 SOD).

⁴ This verse from an uncertain mime of Sophron has a proverbial flavor, which, in absence of other proofs, does not exclude or support belief that Chamaeleon knew the mimes of the poet from Syracusae.

Chamaeleon and Heraclides of Pontus Lived at the Same Time

1b see **16**

HIS NAME

1c Chamaeleon is called Heracleot

1. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 4.84 184d = **4**
2. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 8.19-20 338d = **33**
3. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.16 374a = **46**
4. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.29 427b = **11**
5. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.84 456c = **37**
6. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 11.4 461a = **10**
7. Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.26 170.3 = **14**

1d Chamaeleon is called Pontine

1. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 6.105 273c = **9**
2. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.42 390a = **26**
3. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.72 406e = **47**
4. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.35 430a = **13**
5. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 12.46 533e = **39**
6. Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.18 624a = **5**
7. Anonymous, *On Sappho*, *POxy.* 15 1800, fr. 1 coll. 1-2 = **29**

180 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

1e Chamaeleon dicitur Peripateticus

1. Tatianus, *Oratio ad Graecos* 31 = **15**

1f Chamaeleon dicitur grammaticus

1. Eust. *ad Hom.* Ψ 94 = **21B**

II. SCRIPTA

2 Tabula inscriptionum

A) Philosophica

1. Περὶ ἡδονῆς] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 8.39 347e = **8**;
Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 6.105 273c = **9**

2. Περὶ θεῶν] Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.14 60.3 = **3B**

3. Περὶ μέθης] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11.4 461a = **10**;
Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.29 427b = **11**; Clemens
Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.14 170.3 = **14**

4. Προτρεπτικός] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 4.84 184d = **4**

B) Poetae et genera

5. Περὶ Αἰσχύλου] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.17 375f = **42**;
Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.33 429a = **43A**

6. Περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 12.46 533e
= **39**

7. Περὶ Ἡσιόδου] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.92
25 = 16 = 1b

8. Περὶ Θέσπιδος] *Sud. Lex.* ο 806 = **41**

9. Περὶ Ἰλιάδος] *Schol. vet.* in Apoll. Rhod. *Argonautica* 2.904-
910a = **17**; *Schol. Genav.* in Hom. Φ 390b Erbse = **20**

10. Περὶ Λάσου] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 8.20 338b = **33**

1e Chamaeleon is called Peripatetic

1. Tatian, *Oration to the Greeks* 31 = **15**

1f Chamaeleon is called grammarian

1. Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer, Iliad* 23.94 = **21B**

II. WRITINGS

2 List of Titles

A) Philosophical Works

1. *On Pleasure*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 8.39 347e = **8**; Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 6.105 273c = **9**
2. *On Gods*] Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.14 60.3 = **3B**
3. *On Drunkenness*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 11.4 461a = **10**; Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.29 427b = **11**; Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.14 170.3 = **14**
4. *Exhortation*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 4.84 184d = **4**

B) Poets and Genres

5. *On Aeschylus*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.17 375f = **42**; Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.33 429a = **43A**
6. *On Anacreon*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 12.46 533e = **39**
7. *On Hesiod*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.92 = **16** = **25** = **1B**¹
8. *On Thespis*] Suda, on “Nothing to do with Dionysus” = **41**
9. *On Iliad*] Scholium on the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius 2.904-910a = **17**; Scholium on Homer, *Iliad* 21.390b = **20**
10. *On Lasus*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 8.20 338b = **33**

182 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- 11.Περὶ Ὀμήρου] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.92 = **16**
- 12.Περὶ Πινδάρου] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.32 573c = **35**
- 13.Περὶ Σαπφούς] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.72 599c = **28**
- 14.Περὶ Σιμωνίδου] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.73 656c = **36**; Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.84 456c = **37**; Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.92 611a = **38**
- 15.Περὶ Στησιχόρου] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.12 620c = **30**
- 16.Περὶ κωμωδίας] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.16 374a = **46**
- 17.Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.72 406e = **47**
- 18.Περὶ σατύρων] Apostolius *Cent.* 3.60 = **40A**; *Sud. Lex.* α 3668 = **40B**; *Sud. Lex.* α 3907 = **40C**

11. *On Homer*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.92 = **16**
12. *On Pindar*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.32 573c = **34**
13. *On Sappho*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.72 599c = **28**
14. *On Simonides*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.73 656c = **36**; Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.84 456c = **37**; Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.92 611a = **38**
15. *On Stesichorus*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.12 620c = **30**
16. *On Comedy*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.16 374a = **46**
17. *On Old Comedy*] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.72 406e = **47**²
18. *On Satyrs*] Apostolius, *Cent.* 3.60 = **40A**; Suda, “You destroyed the wine by pouring water on it” = **40B**; Suda, on “Aristios Cyclops” = **40C**

There is evidence for the existence of some treatises, even if titles are not transmitted by ancient sources: *On Odyssey* (see **24** n. 2); *On Alcman* (see **26** n. 2 and **27**). More doubtful the probability of a treatise *On Alcaeus* (see **13** n. 1 and **54**). The identification of the source for **48** (on fables, see notes *ad loc.*) and **49** (on Hyperides and Lycurgus, see notes *ad loc.*) is difficult.

¹ On the existence itself of a treatise *On Hesiod* see **16** n. 1.

² On both titles *On comedy* and *On Old Comedy* see commentary to **46** n. 2 and **47** n. 1.

SAPIENTIA

De dicto ‘nosce te ipsum’

3A PSI 1093, 31-33, s. II p. Chr. (vol. 9, pp. 153-157)

col.1 ἀγορεύειν· Χίλων
ἦρχε λόγου Λακεδα-
ίμονα πατρίδα ναί-
ων, ὅς ποτε καὶ [Πυ-
5 θοῖ τὸ σοφὸν ποτὶ
νηδὸν ἔγραψεν του
.....
18 γνη[.]ε
... ..(.) τάδ’ ἐβυσ-
20 σοδόμευσα φατ-
ίζω ...(.)] τ[ό]τε “μη-
[δὲν ἄγα]ν” καὶ τὸ
“ἐγγύα[ι]. παρὰ δ’ ἄτα.”
Ἑρμιππος δ’ ἐν
25 τῷ πρώτῳ πε-
ρὶ Ἀριστοτέλους
Λάβυν] Δελφὸν εὐ-
νοῦχ]όν φησιν εἰ-
ρηκέναι] αὐτὸ νε-
30 ωκόρον] ὄν[τ]α τοῦ

col.2 Πυθίου, Χαμαιλέ-
ων δὲ Θαλῆν τὸν
[Ἑξαμύο]ν. Κλέαρ-
χος δ’ ἐν τοῖς περὶ
35 παροιμιῶν ἐρέ-
σθαι πότε τὸν Χίλω-
να τὸν θεόν, τί ἄρ-
ιστον ἂν εἶη, τὴν
δὲ Πυθίαν] ἀποκρί-
40 νασθαι ὅτι] τὸ “γνώ[θι

WISDOM

On the Saying “Know Thyself”

3A *PSI* 1093, 31-33

to speak; Chilon¹ was the first to use the saying when he dwelled in his homeland, Lacedaemon. He also once wrote the wise (saying) on the temple at Delphi of the . . . having pondered these things I state . . . Then “nothing in excess” and the (statement) “when there is a guarantee, there is folly.” Hermippus in his first book *On Aristotle* claims that Labys² the eunuch of Delphi said this when he was warden of the Pythian temple, but Chamaeleon says it was Thales, son of Examyus³. Clearchus in his work *On Proverbs* said that Chilon once asked the god, “what is best?” The Pythian answered, “Know thyself.”

σεαυτὸν”. ἐν]ιοι δ’ α[ὖ
 Σωδά]μου τοῦ
 Τεγεάτου] φασὶν
 τὸ [“μηδὲν ἄγ]αν” ὑπο
 45 σ[τατ [...] σ[.]αυτην
] εἶνα[ι·
 ταῦτ’ ἐ]λεγεν Σώδα-
 μο[ς Ἐ]πηράτου, ὅς
 μ’ ἀ[ν]έθηκεν· “μη-
 50 δ[ἐ]ν ἄγαν· καιρῶι
 π[άντ]α πάρεστι καλ[ά.]”]
 “ἢ [λέγε τι [σιγῆς κρεῖσ-
 σον ἢ σιγὴν ἔχε”.
 καὶ τοῦτο Εὐριπί-
 55 δου τινὲς ὑπολαμ-
 βάνουσιν εἶναι, αὐ-
 τῶι τῶι γνωμικὸν
 εἶναι τὸν στίχον
 ἐπερειδόμενοι·
 60 ἐστ[ι] δὲ Διονυσίου.

1-20 *cf. Sch. Eur. Hipp. 264 Dindorf* 24-31 *Hermippus FGrHist cont. 29a Bollansée = CPF Hermippus 2T = fr. 47a Wehrli* 24-25 *cf. Clem. Strom. I.14, p. 39,1-5 Stählin* τὸ δ’ ἐγγύα, παρὰ δ’ ἄτα ... οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλη Χίλωνος αὐτὸ νομίζουσι (*locum ad Chamaeleontem referendum secundum Lorenzoni*², p. 143, *vd. infra fr. dubium 52*) 24-41 *Clearchus fr. 69d Wehrli = CPF Clearchus 1T (33-41)* 27 et 36-37 *schol. in Plat. Phil. 29 (ad 48c10) Cufalo = Hermippus FGrHist cont. F 29c Bollansée = fr. 47c Wehrli* 52-53 *nec non 60 cf. Stob. Anth. 3.34.1* Διονυσίου· ἢ λέγε τι σιγῆς κρεῖττον ἢ σιγῆς ἔχε *Dionysius trag. TrGF 76 F6 Snell-Kannicht, vol. I, p. 244*

1-6 *suppl. Norsa-Vitelli* 7-11 *perexigua litterarum vestigia leguntur* 12-17 *sex lineae desiderantur* 18-21 *perexiguas litteras leg. et suppl. Snell* 31 Πυθίου *suppl. Snell* : ἱεροῦ *dub. Norsa-Vitelli* 31-33 Χ]αμαιλέων δὲ Θάλῃν τὸν | [Ἐξαμύο]υ *suppl. Snell* : Χ]αμαιλέων | δὲ τὴν γνώμην τοπ[ά – <?> | ζει <?> Θαλο]ῦ *Vitelli* 35-47 *suppl. Snell* 52-53 κρεῖσσον *Nauck*², *Snell* : κρεσσον *P*, κρεῖττον *Stob.* 53 ἔχε *Stobaeus* : ἔχης *P*

But some again . . . of Sodamus of Tegea⁴ the saying “nothing in excess” by . . . herself . . . to be. Sodamus son of Eperatus used to say these things and entrusted them to me: “nothing in excess;” “all things are good at the right moment;” “either say something better than silence or keep silence.” Some assume that this saying was Euripides’, attributing the gnomic line to him himself, but it was Dionysius’⁵.

From a book on the Seven Wise Men and sayings attributed to them, founded on a treatise that is probably to be identified with one of Didymus (see Rostagni, p. 590, Montanari, *CPF* I.1* p. 404, Bollansée, *FGrHist* VIa.3, p. 311, Martano, p. 32 n. 22), built on Peripatetic sources (about studies of Paroemiography in the Peripatos, see Lelli, pp. 16-22).

¹ On Chilon, Spartan ephor around the middle of the 6th century BC and numbered among the Seven Wise Men, see *RE* III.2, s.v. “Chilon” (1), coll. 2278-79 (Niese).

² On Labys, eunuch and νεωκόρος in the temple of Apollo in Delphi and his connection with the phratry of Labyadai see Bollansée, *FGrHist* VIa.3, pp. 307-9.

³ Chamaeleon’s fragment is contained in lines 32-34.

⁴ On Sodamus of Tegea, see *DNP* 11, s.v. “Sodamos”, coll. 666-667 (M. di Marco).

⁵ Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse and author of tragedies, comedies and historical treatises, see *TrGF* v. 1, p. 240, and Suess, who is quoted there.

188 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Περὶ θεῶν

3B Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.14 60.3 (vol. 1, p. 38 Stählin)

2a W τὸ μὲν οὖν γινῶθι σαυτὸν οἱ μὲν Χίλωνος ὑπειλήφασι, Χαμαιλέων δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ θεῶν Θάλου, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τῆς Πυθίας.

2 *Arist. fr. 3 Rose*³

3C *Glossae Rhetoricae* (AG vol. 1, p. 233.13-16 Bekker)

2b W γ ν ῶ θ ι σ α υ τ ὀ ν· ἀπόφθεγμα· οἱ δὲ Χείλωνός φασιν. Ἑρμιππος δὲ Δελφὸν ἐνοῦχόν φησιν εἰρηκέναι τὸ γινῶθι σαυτὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ ναῷ ἐπιγράψαι. Χαμαιλέων δὲ Θαλοῦ φησιν εἶναι τὴν γνώμην ταύτην.

2-3 *Hermippus FGrHist cont. 29b Bollansée = fr. 47b Wehrli*

MUSICA ET ETHICA

Institutio auletica

Προτρεπτικός

4 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 4.84 184c-d (*BT* vol. 1 p. 402.8-15 Kaibel)

3 W ἔμελεν δὲ τοῖς πάλαι πᾶσιν Ἑλλησι μουσικῆς·

3B Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.14 60.3

Some have assumed that the saying “know thyself” was Chilon’s, but Chamaeleon in the book *On Gods*¹ says it was Thales’,² and Aristotle says it was the Pythian’s.

¹The context of this fragment in the *Patchwork* of Clement of Alexandria is devoted to the origins of Greek wisdom, from Orpheus and Linus, through the Seven Wise Men, to the most important philosophical schools. This path is in some ways similar to what appears in the few fragments that Rose refers to Aristotle’s *Περὶ φιλοσοφίας* (fr. 1-26 Rose³) Authors of similar books *Περὶ θεῶν* were Theophrastus (Diog. Laert. 5.48 = FHS&G 1.244), Strato of Lampsacus (Diog. Laert. 5.59 = fr. 1.14 Sharples), while a long fragment of Eudemus of Rhodes (150 Wehrli) is dedicated to the history of theology. The *Περὶ χρηστηρίων*, *Περὶ χρησμῶν*, and the *Κτίσεις ἱερῶν* of Heraclides of Pontus evidently also had something to do with the sacred world (see fr. 17.54a-b-55 Schütrumpf). As stated by Wehrli¹, col. 369, the form of Chamaeleon’s *On Gods* was probably dialogic.

²The theme of these fragments appears to have a tenuous relationship to the argument suggested by the title of the work. It can be assumed that Chamaeleon was dealing with a theme connected with the Apollonian cult and so he made reference to the saying written on the temple of Apollo at Delphi and its author, or rather, like his predecessors, he was tracing the origins of religion and wisdom of the Greeks and therefore touched on one of the landmarks in the development of both.

3C *Rhetorical Sayings*

Know thyself: a saying. Some say it was Chilon’s. Hermippus says the Delphic eunuch said, “know thyself”, and inscribed it on the temple. Chamaeleon says that this saying was Thales’.

MUSIC AND ETHICS

Auletic Learning

4 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 4.84 184c-d

Music was a concern to all the ancient Greeks. Therefore

190 **Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea**

184d διόπερ καὶ ἡ αὐλητικὴ περισπούδαστος ἦν. Χαμαιλέων
γούν ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Προτρεπτικῷ
Λακεδαιμονίους φησὶ καὶ Θηβαίους πάντας αὐλεῖν
μανθάνειν, Ἡρακλεώτας τε τοὺς ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ καθ' ἑαυτὸν 5
ἔτι, Ἀθηναίων τε τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους, Καλλίαν τε τὸν
Ἱππονίκου καὶ Κριτίαν τὸν Καλλαίσχρου.

2-7 *Critias* 88 A15 D.-K., vol. II, p. 374 *cf. etiam Arist. Polit.* 8.6 1341a31 (p. 286 *Immisch*)

De musica ad cohibendam iram

5 *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae* 14.18 623f-624a (*BT* vol. 3 p. 376.5-11 *Kaibel*)

4W καὶ γὰρ (*scil.* ἡ μουσικὴ) τὰ ἥθη παιδεύει καὶ τοὺς
θυμοειδεῖς καὶ τὰς γνώμας διαφόρους καταπραΰνει.
624a Κλεινίας γούν ὁ Πυθαγόρειος, ὡς Χαμαιλέων ὁ Ποντικὸς

aulòs playing was very serious.¹ In his work entitled *Exhortation*,² however, Chamaeleon the Heracleot says that Lacedaemonians and the Thebans all learned to play the aulos, and that the Heracleots of his own days still do, as well as the most outstanding Athenians, such as Callias³ son of Hipponicus and Critias⁴ son of Callaeschos.

¹ Musical knowledge was considered necessary for philosophy, as we can read in Cicero's *Hortensius*, fr. 89 Grilli (= Lact. *Inst. Div.* 3.25, 7-12): "Many arts are necessary for approaching philosophy. . . Geometry and music and astrology are necessary because these arts have some affinity with philosophy." The same relevance of music in education is supported by Aristotle, *Polit.* 1340B: "From these considerations therefore it is clear that music can create a certain effect on the character of the soul, and if it can do this, clearly the young must be directed to music and educated in it." The interpretation of Giordano², p. 117, which, thanks to the context of Athenaeus himself, connects the contents of the fragment with what is said by Aristotle, *Polit.* 1341a, that auletic practice should be avoided in the education of young people turned to political activity, appears to exceed the limits of the passage of Chamaeleon in our possession, which rather focuses on the role assigned by Greeks to music and, perhaps, the effects that music can have on the soul of those who practice or listen to it (see **5**: [ἡ μουσική] τὰ ἥθη παιδεύει, and **6**, with an explicit reference to musical ψυχαγωγία).

² Other Peripatetic authors of treatises named *Protrepticus* were Aristotle himself, whose work is preserved in several fragments (frr. 50-61 Rose³), Theophrastus (Diog. Laert. 5.49, 50) and Demetrius of Phaleron (Diog. Laert. 5.81). Note that Koepke, pp. 36-37, led by the subject of the fragment, proposed to integrate Προτρεπτικός with περὶ μουσικῆς, attributing to this treatise most of the fragments regarding musical themes. Scorza, pp. 46-47 is rightly opposed to this hypothesis. As stated by Wehrli¹, col. 369, the form of Chamaeleon's *Protrepticus* was probably dialogic.

³ On Callias, an Athenian of 5th century BC and promoter of the peace with Persians in 449 BC, see *RE* X.2, s.v. "Kallias" (2), coll. 1615-18 (H. Swoboda) and *DNP* 6, s.v. "Kallias" (4), coll. 177-178 (W. Will).

⁴ On Critias, an antidemocratic sophist, one of the Thirty Tyrants killed in the battle against Thrasybulus in 403 BC, see *RE* XI.2, s.v. "Kritias" (5), coll. 1901-1912 (Diehl) and *DNP* 6, s.v. "Kritias", coll. 851-52 (B. Zimmermann).

Music to Hold Anger

5 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.18 623f-624a

Indeed, (music) teaches character and soothes the high-spirited and those differing in their ideas. However, Cleinias the Pythagorean,¹ as Chamaeleon of Pontus reports, who differed in

ἱστορεῖ, καὶ τῷ βίῳ καὶ τοῖς ἥθησιν διαφέρων, εἴ ποτε
συνέβαινε χαλεπαίνειν αὐτὸν δι’ ὀργήν, ἀναλαμβάνων τὴν 5
λύραν ἐκithάριζεν. πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐπιζητοῦντας τὴν αἰτίαν
ἔλεγεν “πραῦνομαι”.

*cf. etiam Aelian. Var. Hist. 14.23, ubi, sine Chamaeleontis nomine, eadem
narrantur* Κλεινίας ἀνὴρ ἦν σπουδαῖος τὸν τρόπον, Πυθαγορεῖος δὲ
τὴν σοφίαν· οὗτος εἴ ποτε ἐς ὀργήν προήχθη καὶ εἶχεν αἰσθητικῶς
ἑαυτοῦ ἐς θυμὸν ἐξαγομένου, παραχρῆμα πρὶν ἢ ἀνάπλεως αὐτῷ ἡ
ὀργὴ καὶ ἐπίδηλος γένηται, ὅπως διάκειται, τὴν λύραν ἀρμονισάμενος
ἐκithάριζε. πρὸς δὲ τοὺς πυνθανομένους τὴν αἰτίαν ἀπεκρίνατο ἐμμελῶς
“πραῦνομαι”. 1-2 *cf. Arist. Polit. 8.5 1340a1-b9 (pp. 282-84 Immisch)* 3-7
Clinias 54 A4 D.-K., vol. I, p. 444

4 τῷ βίῳ A : τῇ γνώμῃ C διαφέρων Casaubon : διαφορῶν codd.

De musicae facultate ad trahendum animum

6 Philodemus, *De musica* 4, *PHerc.* 424+1572, coll. 46.45-47.22,
pp. 73-75 Delattre (= I, col. XXX, ll. 1-21, n° 34 p. 219 Rispoli =
p. 40 van Krevelen = pp. 17-18 Kemke)

6W45 πρὸς ψυχᾷ-||
col.47 γωγίαν ἰδίαι περιειληφ[α]θα[ι
παρά [γ]ε τοῖς μελοποιοῖς, ὅσοι
χρησίμως πεφιλοῖ)μουσῇ-
κλασιν· μὴ γὰρ κακῶς ἐπιση-
5 μ]αίνεσθαι Χαμαιλέοντα τὸ
τοιούτῳν τι τοὺς κωμικοὺς
α[ι]νίττεσθαι περὶ τῶν ποη-
τῶν προσηγορίαις μὲν χρω-
μ]ένους ταῖς τῶν βρωτῶν
10 καὶ ποτῶν, παρ]ριστάντας δὲ
τὴν ιδιότητα | [τ]ούτων *. Ἔχειν
δέ τι καὶ πρὸς φ[ι]λίαν οἰκείον·
ἐπεὶ δὴ γὰρ πρὸς ἔρω[τ]’ ἐδείχθη, κα[ι]
πρὸς τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ | [λ]όγον αἰ- ※
15 ρεῖν *. ἔτι δ’, ἐπεὶ πρὸς [τὰ συμ]π[ό]-
σια, καὶ [π]ρ[ο]τ[ὸ]ς τὸ τέλος [αὐτῶν

his way of life and in his character, if it ever happened that he had difficulties because of anger, took up the lyre and played it.² In response to those seeking the reason he used to say, “I am soothed.”

¹ On Cleinias, a Pythagorean from Tarentum, see *RE* XI.1, s.v. “Kleinias” (6), col. 617 (Stenzel) and *DNP* 6, s.v. “Kleinias”, col. 562 (Ch. Riedweg).

² In line with Peripatetic and Pythagorean theory (see Arist. *Polit.* 1341a-b and Aristox. fr. 26 Wehrli; see also Matelli², pp. 162-163), Chamaeleon recognizes the soothing-cathartic power of music through the example of Cleinias, a Pythagorean himself, who calmed his anger playing the lyre, the “Pythagorean instrument par excellence” (Matelli², p. 162 and n. 34; see also Rispoli¹, p. 224).

On Psychagogic Power of Music

6 Philodemus, *On Music* 4, coll. 46.45-47.22

... its particular functions extend to *psychagogia*, at least among the lyric poets who have taken advantage of their love of music.¹ In fact, Chamaeleon was not wrong to endorse the idea that comic writers expressed the same sort of thing in an enigmatic form, when, about poets, they used to designate them by the names of foods and beverages, and thus put forward their particular characters.² In addition [music] is also appropriate to friendship: indeed, since the demonstration was made that this is the case with love, logic also extends to its end. Moreover, friendliness also appears to extend to banquets, and to their end.

φαίνεσθα[ι π]άλι, φιλο[ι]φροσύ[ι]-
 νην· εἰ δὲ [πρ]ὸς ταύτ[ην, οὐδὲ
 πρὸς φιλίαν ἄλλως [ἔ]χειν, ὅτι
 20 τὴν [ψυχὴ]ν ἀνίησιν [καὶ ἀφι-
 λαροῖ καὶ ἡμ]ᾶς διαλ[υ]τικοὺς
 ποιεῖ]

46.45 *e col. 131,29 rest. Delattre* 47.1 ἰδίαι *Delattre* : ἰδίαν *Rispoli*
 περιελήφ[α]θα[ι *e φ Delattre* : ..ικα..φαθαι| *e N Rispoli* 2 παρά [γ]ε *e φ*
Delattre, om. Kemke 3 πεφ[ι]-*post Kemke Rispoli* 5-6 τὸ|τοιοῦτόν *e φ Delattre*
 : το|ιοῦτόν *non recte div. Kemke* 7|αἰ|νίτ- *e φ Delattre* (|αἰ|νίτ- *Kemke*) 7-8
 ποη|τῶν *e φ Delattre* 8 χρω-| *e φ Delattre* (χρω-| *post Kemke Rispoli*) ταῖς
post Kemke Rispoli 9 βρωτῶν *coll. col. 132,26-27 e φ Delattre* : [ἐ]ρώτων
dubit. Kemke 10 ποτῶν *coll. col. 132,26 e φ Delattre* παρ[ι]στάντας *e P +*
N Delattre : ...εἰς πάντας *post Kemke Rispoli* 11 [τ]ούτων *e φ Delattre* ([το]-
Kemke) 12|δέ *post Kemke Rispoli* φ[ι]λί(μ *N*)αν *e P φ Delattre* (φ[ι]λί)αν
Kemke) οἰκ(χ *N*)εῖον| *e φ Delattre* ([ο]ἰκεῖον| *Kemke*) 13 ἔρω[τ]’ *Delattre*
 (ἔρω[τα *post Kemke Rispoli*) ἐδείχθη *e φ Delattre* (ἐ[δ]είχ[θ]η *Kemke*) 14
fin. asteriscum φ vidit Delattre 15 [τὰ συμ]π[ό]-| *Delattre* : [συμπό]-| *paulo*
brevius Kemke 16 [π]ρ(χ *N*)ρ[ὸ]τ(α *N*)[ς] *Rispoli* ([π]ρ[ὸς] *Kemke*) 17 -σθα[ι
 π]άλι *e N post Kemke Rispoli* φιλο[ι]φροσύ[ι]- ([φροσύ] *Kemke*) *e col. 132,3 rest.*
Delattre 18 οὐδὲ| *coni. Delattre* : καὶ| *Kemke Rispoli* 19 post φιλίαν *interp.*
Kemke [ἔ]χειν, ὅτι| *coni. Delattre* : [δὲ καὶ| *Kemke* 20 [ψυχὴ]ν *post Kemke*
Rispoli ἀφι]λαροῖ *Delattre* (ἀφι]λαροῖ *Kemke Rispoli*) 21-22 καὶ ἡμ]ᾶς
 διαλ[υ]τικοὺς ποιεῖ *e col. 132,31-33 suppl. Delattre* :]ᾶς διὰ [*Rispoli*

And if (music) extends to it to friendliness, it is no different with friendship, because (music) relaxes and gladdens the soul and disposes us to reconciliation.³

This short quotation is taken from the final section of the first third of Book IV of the *Περὶ μουσικῆς* of Philodemus, a book entirely dedicated to the presentation and refutation of a Stoic treatise of the same name by Diogenes of Babylon (see Delattre², p. 31, Blank, pp. 55-56, and Rispoli², pp. 98-99). It is therefore a direct quotation from the Stoic treatise, in which Chamaeleon is quoted as support for the theory that was advocated there (see Delattre¹, pp. 67ff.), according to a clearly identified method of Diogenes, which also made use of Plato and Aristotle (see Delattre¹, p. 72); in a similar way, Diogenes quoted Heraclides of Pontus (115b Schütrumpf = 162 Wehrli – see Rispoli², p. 94) and Dicaearchus (39 Mirhady = 93 Wehrli, see Rispoli², p. 96) as proof of his theory about the nature of musical perception as *sensation savante* and its effect on human *ἦθος*. Philodemus, however, assigns music to the domain of *ἄλογον*, denying its influence on the *ἦθος* (see Delattre², p. 32). Wehrli², p. 71, and Giordano², pp. 96-97, attribute the fragment to the *Προτρεπτικός*; Scorza, pp. 46-47, puts this text among those of uncertain origin and thinks it belongs to a work on lyric poets, perhaps Stesichorus. Rispoli¹, pp. 223-26, suggests that comes from the *Προτρεπτικός* or from the *Περὶ τῆς (ἀρχαίας) κωμωδίας*.

¹ The passage attributable to Chameleon evidently alludes to the psychagogical power of music. Like Aristotle and Theophrastus, Chamaeleon recognized the importance of the effect that music can have on the human soul: there is an explicit reference to *ψυχαγωγία* as a typical trait (*ἰδίαι*) of musical practice (see 4 and 5). For this reason Chamaeleon refers to *μελοποιοί* and the utility that they drew from the music itself (*χρησίμως πεφιλομουσήκασιν*).

² Scorza, p. 46, suggests that Chamaeleon “alluda alla mania dei comici di prendere in giro i poeti lirici.” Giordano², p. 121, in the same wake, proposes that Chamaeleon is referring to the comic poets, who “con spirito satirico e tono polemico prospettavano la duplice valenza della psicagogia dei poeti lirici, sia la capacità di indurre gli animi a ignobili passioni o di placare l’ardore dell’amore, sia la possibilità di creare nei banchetti la *φιλοφροσύνη*, il fine immanente dei *συμπόσια*.” The passage seems to refer to the use by comic writers of associating individual poets to nicknames derived from the names of drinks and foods, which highlighted their special nature and the characteristics (*ιδιότης*) of their poetry. This, then, would seem to allude not only to the fact that *ποίησις* and *μουσική* appeared associated in the theory of Diogenes (see Blank, pp. 57ff.), but perhaps also that both arts could push their users to a certain kind of feeling, symbolized by types of food. Delattre, ed., p. 365 n. 7: “Le caractère fragmentaire du texte de Diogène rend difficile, sinon risquée, l’explication de sous-entendus. Toutefois, on pourrait essayer de comprendre ainsi ce passage: Diogène mettait sur un même plan les plaisirs de l’oreille (musique/poesie lyrique) et ceux du goût (aliments et boissons) pour tenter d’exprimer la seduction exercée par la musique sur l’âme. Un bon vin, un mets exquis ont été longuement et savamment élaborés avant de pouvoir transporter d’aise ceux qui l’absorberont. Un bon compositeur lyrique, un bon poète (comprendons: leurs œuvres) seraient alors comme un plat gastronomique exceptionnel ou un tres bon vin, offrant des subtilités

- 7 Philodemus, *De musica*, 4, *PHerc.* 1497/XVII, col. 131,17-35, pp. 251-252 Delattre (= col. XVII, 17-35 p. 61 Neubecker = p. 171 van Krevelen = pp. 83-84 Kemke)

5W Κἂν τῶι λοιπῷ
 βίῳι τοιγαροῦν ἔκ τινων
 χρόνων, εἰ καὶ μὴ παρ' ὅ- ※
 20 λον σχεδὸν ὥς οὗτος ἔγρα-
 ψε, ποι[κί]λη[ν] διαγωγὴν
 ὑπὸ [τῶν μ]ουσικῶν παρα-
 σκευ[ά]ζεσθαι προσδεχόμε-
 νοι, τὸ π[ο]ικίλον καὶ πλεῖ-
 25 ον, ὑπ[ὸ] τ[ῶν] συμπλεκομέ-
 νων γί[νε]σθαι φήσομεν, οὐ-
 χ ὑπὸ τῶ]ν τῆς μουσικῆς
 χρ[ώ]ματων· ἃ δὲ δὴ γρά-
 φει π[ρ]ὸς ψυχ[α]γωγίαν ἰδί-
 30 αι περιειληφ[θ]αι παρὰ τοῖς
 μελοποιοῖς καὶ τυγχάνειν
 ἐπιστάσεως ὑπὸ Χαμαιλέ-
 οντος, ἅπαντα σχεδὸν δι-
 ανοημά[τ]ων εἶναι καὶ πο-
 35 ητικῆς ἰδιώματα*.

18 *paragraphus marg. sin. videtur O N* 23 -[ά]ζεσθαι *e P Delattre* (-[άζ]εσθαι *Kemke*) 25 ὑπ[ὸ] τ[ῶν] *Kemke* : ὑπ[ὸ] τ[ῶν] *Neubecker* 26 γί[νε]- *ex O Delattre* : γί[νε]- *Kemke* 27 ὑπὸ τῶ]ν *e P Delattre* : ὑπὸ *Kemke* [ὑπὸ γε] *Ac* 28 χρ[ώ]ματων· *potius quam* ἀρ[μονιῶ]ν· *Delattre* (*punctum altum post ν videtur P*) ἃ δὲ *e P coni. Delattre* : ἀ[ὐ]τῆς, ἅτινα δὲ *Kemke* 29 -[φ]ει π(vel κ *P*)[ρ]ὸς *coni. Delattre* : -[φ]οι τ[ὴν] *Kemke* -[φ]ει τ[ὴν] *van Krevelen* ψυχ[α]γωγίαν *post Kemke e φ Delattre* : εὐα]γωγίαν *in app. dub. von Arnim* 30 περιειληφ[θ]αι *e col. 47,1 rest. Delattre* : π[ε]πορίσθαι *Kemke* 31 μελοποιοῖς *e P et col. 47,2 rest. Delattre* (μελ[ο]π[ο]ιοῖς *Kemke*) 32 -σεω(.ι *O*)ς *Delattre* (-σε[ω]ς *Kemke*) 33 ἅπαν- *e φ Delattre* (ἅπ[α]ν- *Kemke*) σχε- *e φ Delattre* (σχ[ε]- *Kemke*) 34 [τ]ων *e P Delattre* ([τ]ων *Kemke*) 35 ἰδιώματα *coni. Delattre*

de goût et des parfums qui leur sont tout-à-fait spécifiques et inimitables.”

³ What is said here corresponds clearly with the beginning of this passage: if it is true that μελοποιοί were effectively benefited by their love for music, it is evident, – in the opinion of Diogenes that Philodemus reports – that it can equally facilitate the creation of the frame of mind (here considered as τέλος: see *SVF*, v. 4, pp. 143-44 von Arnim) typical for φιλία and συμπόσια. Through its psychagogic power it has an influence on the ἦθος, because of its ability, among others, to ἀνιήναι and ἀφιλαροῦν τὴν ψυχὴν, disposing men to reconciliation.

7 Philodemus, *On Music* 4, col. 131.17-35

That is why, while admitting that in the rest of life, at certain times – even if it is not “almost always” as our opponent (Diogenes of Babylon) has written – the musicians offer “a varied way of spending time”,¹ we will say that variety comes about for the most part (from the rhythms) interwoven with <melody>, not from the tones of the music.² And what (Diogenes) writes about “its particular functions extend to *psychagogia* among the lyric poets,” also got the attention of Chamaeleon, are almost all features of the thoughts and properties of poetry.³

Following the method of Philodemus, this second fragment, which is taken from the second and longest section of the fourth book of his *Περὶ μουσικῆς*, quotes what is found earlier in order to refute it (see Delattre¹, p. 67 and Delattre², p. 31).

¹ Philodemus seems to allude critically to the psychagogical power of lyric, which facilitates behaviors of various kinds.

² Against the Peripatetic theory, which assigns to music the power to influence the soul in different ways, Philodemus argues that this action is due solely to poetry, which addresses reason, and not to music, which is an object of sensation (see Delattre², pp. 31-32 and Rispoli², p. 97).

³ The reference to Chamaeleon is included in this criticism: whatever he specified about the poets and their unique characteristics – attributing their power perhaps only to music – Philodemus attributes only to poetry.

DE VOLUPTATE

De Aeschyli tragoediarum gloria serius obtenta

Περὶ ἡδονῆς

8 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 8.39 347e-f (*BT* vol. 2 p. 263.1-5
Kaibel)

7w Φιλόσοφος δὲ ἦν τῶν πάνυ ὁ Αἰσχύλος, ὃς καὶ ἡττηθεὶς
ἄδίκως ποτέ, ὥς Θεόφραστος ἢ Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ
ἡδονῆς εἶρηκεν, ἔφη χρόνῳ τὰς τραγωδίας ἀνατιθέναι,
εἰδὼς ὅτι κομιεῖται τὴν προσήκουσαν τιμήν.

347f *Thphr. fr. 553 FHS&G = L113 Fortenbaugh = Aesch. TrGF T 133 Radt* *cf.*
Eust. Iliad. 1298.55 Van der Valk (= Aesch. TrGF T 113b Radt) *Aristoph.*
Ran. 868 (= Aesch. TrGF T 120 Radt) *schol. Aristoph. Acharn. 10* *Quintil.*
Inst. or. 10.1.66 *Vita Aesch. 12, p. 35 Radt*

ON PLEASURE

On the Glory of Aeschylus' Dramas Late Achieved

8 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 8.39 347e-f

Aeschylus was among those who are most philosophical.¹ Even when unjustly defeated on some occasion, as Theophrastus or Chamaeleon² stated in the (work) *On Pleasure*,³ he said that he dedicated his tragedies to (all) time, knowing that he would acquire the proper honor.⁴

¹ On Aeschylus as a σοφός see Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1154, where the joke of Euripides, (“the *sophos* Aeschylus told us the same thing twice”) plays on repetition in Aeschylus’ verses, evidently referring to a well known saying of the tragedian where Dionysus, when choosing the best tragic poet, says about Aeschylus and Euripides: “I consider the one *sophos*, but I enjoy the other” (1413; cf. 1433). As σοφός Aeschylus is also depicted in a scholium on Hesiod, *Works and Days* 412: “For Aeschylus is old, and *sophos*”. John Chortasmenus (14th-15th century AD) also seems to allude to the tradition of his philosophic wisdom: referring to *Seven against Thebae* 593 (“he does not wish to appear best, but to be best”), he says: “Aeschylus was philosophical”. See also Fortenbaugh³, in this volume, n. 23.

² Treatises on this subject interested Peripatetics since Aristotle, whose two books *Περὶ ἡδονῆς* appears in Diogenes Laertius’ list in 5.22. Theophrastus (Diog. Laert. 5.44) and Strato (Diog. Laert. 5.59), his successors as head of the school, and, Heraclides of Pontus (Diog. Laert. 5.88), whose pupil Chamaeleon probably was, also wrote such works. As stated by Wehrli¹, col. 369, the form of Chamaeleon’s *On Pleasure* was probably dialogic.

³ In both fragments from Chamaeleon’s *On Pleasure* (8 and 9) handed down by Athenaeus, the attribution to Theophrastus or Chamaeleon is doubtful. In 9, Athenaeus states that the same book was also transmitted under the name of Theophrastus (similar cases of double authorship are reported by Koepke, p. 44). Tradition informs us that Theophrastus composed two works *On Pleasure* and one *On False Pleasure* (Diog. Laert. 5.44,46). It was perhaps the same name and the similarity of content that gave the impression that the work of Chamaeleon could belong to Theophrastus and cause confusion in the ancient manuscript tradition. It seems very unlikely, however, that the work of the more famous Theophrastus could be, at some point, attributed to the less known Chamaeleon. See Koepke, p. 44; Scorza, pp. 41-42, Steffen, pp. 38-39, Wehrli², pp. 71-72, Giordano², pp. 122-123 and Fortenbaugh³, in this volume.

⁴ The subject of the one true εὐδαιμονία evidently arose in Chamaeleon’s treatise on ἡδονή. The content of 8 is probably attributable to people who included in the τιμή the source of their happiness. The case of Aeschylus is

Smindyrides

Περὶ ἡδονῆς

9 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 6.105 273b-c (*BT* vol. 2 p. 106.19-107.1 Kaibel)

8W Ἄλλ' οὐ Σμινδυρίδης ὁ Συβαρίτης τοιοῦτος, ὦ Ἕλληνες,
 273c ὃς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀγαρίστης τῆς Κλεισθένους θυγατρὸς ἐξορμῶν
 γάμον ὑπὸ χλιδῆς καὶ τρυφῆς χιλίους συνεπήγετο οἰκέτας,
 ἀλιεῖς καὶ ὀρνιθευτὰς καὶ μαγείρους· οὗτος δ' ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ
 ἐνδείξασθαι βουλόμενος ὥς εὐδαιμόνως ἔζη, ὥς ἱστορεῖ 5
 Χαμαιλέων ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡδονῆς (τὸ δ' αὐτὸ
 βιβλίον καὶ ὥς Θεοφράστου φέρεται), οὐκ ἔφη τὸν ἥλιον
 ἐτῶν εἴκοσιν οὔτ' ἀνατέλλοντα οὔτε δυόμενον ἑωρακέσθαι.
 καὶ τοῦτ' ἦν αὐτῷ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν.
 οὗτος, ὥς ἔοικεν, πρῶτ' ἐκάθευδεν, ὁψὲ δ' ἠγείρετο, 10
 κατ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν δυστυχῶν.

Thphr. fr. 550 FHS&G = L110 Fortenbaugh de Smindyride et eius divitiis cf. Herod. 6.127 Timaeum FGrHist 566 F 9 (ex Ath. Deipn. 12.541b-c) Arist. Ethic. Eudem. 1.5 1216a11ss. Thphr. fr. 551 FHS&G = L111 Fortenbaugh (ex Athen. 12.511c, etiam hoc Theophrasti fragmentum Chamaeleonti adscripsit Koepke, fr. 34, pp. 46-47, refutavit Scorza, pp. 42-43, vd. infra, fr. dubium 53) Aelian. Var. Hist. 9.24 Diod. Sic. 8.19 Sud.lex. σ 1271 Adler s.v. Συβαριτικάῳ 7-8 Cic. De fin. 2.23, Sen. Epist. 122.2 cf. etiam Ath. Deipn. 12.520a. (de Sybaritis) et 526b (de Colophoniis) Sud.lex. τ 597 Adler s.v. Τιμάσιος

1 Σμινδυρίδης *codd.* : Μινδυρίδης *Diod. 8.19* 2 Ἀγαρίστης *Kaibel* : Ἀγαρόστης *AC* 3 χιλίους : ἰδίους *Diod. 8.19* 10 ἠγείρετο *cett.* : ἀνίστατο *C*

probably given as a positive example: if, according to Aristotle, the happiness that comes from honor seems more on the side of those honoring than the honored (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1095b25), the σοφία of Aeschylus that is praised by the Heracleot consisted in indifference to this issue. It is not unlikely that Chamaeleon agreed with Aristotle in identifying happiness as the highest good in the practice of human virtue, that is knowledge/reason, and even criticized those who believed, on the contrary, that happiness was easily identifiable with pleasure, wealth or honor (*Eth. Nic.* 1095a23). See also Fortenbaugh³, in this volume.

Smindyrides

9 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 6.105 273b-c

But Smindyrides¹ of Sybaris was not this sort of person, oh Greeks. When he set out to marry Agariste², the daughter of Cleisthenes³, and was motivated by delicacy and luxury, he took along a thousand servants, fisherman, fowlers, and cooks. This man, wanting to show how happily he was living, as Chamaeleon of Pontus records in the (work) *On Pleasure* – the same book is also regarded as that of Theophrastus⁴ – said that in twenty years he had not seen the sun either rise or set. This to him was great and wonderful with regard to happiness⁵. It seems, he used to go to sleep early in the morning and wake up late, being wretched in both cases.

¹ As can be seen from the apparatus, Smindyrides was well known to historians such as Herodotus and Timaeus and his character was usually cited by authors of ethical treatises, like Aristotle's *Ethica Eudemia* and Theophrastus' *On Pleasure* (see "Smindyrides", *RE* suppl. X, col. 920 [K. von Fritz]). He certainly seemed, in Chamaeleon as well as in Aristotle (*Eth. Eud.* 1216a11ff.) "to place *eudaimonia* in feeling pleasure"; the connection is obvious then between Chamaeleon's 9 and the more general issue of happiness and pleasure that occupied the treatise (see above, 8 n. 4). On this fragment see Fortenbaugh³, in this volume and Gorman, esp. p. 50.

² On Agariste, wife of the Alcmeonid Megacles and mother of Cleisthenes, see *RE* I.1, s.v. "Agariste", col. 735, and *DNP* 1, s.v. "Agariste", col. 232 (E. Stein-Hölkeskapp).

³ On Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon between 7th and 6th cent. BC, see *RE* XI.1 s.v. "Kleisthenes" coll. 619-20 (Kahrstedt) col. 619 and *DNP* 6, s.v. "Kleisthenes"(1), col. 569 (B. Patzek).

⁴ see above, 8 n. 3.

⁵ see above, 8 n. 4.

VINUM

De magnorum poculorum recenti usu apud Graecos

Περὶ μέθης

10 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11.4 461a-d (*BT* vol. 3 p. 4.1-26 Kaibel)

9w Χαμαιλέων δ' ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ περὶ μέθης, εἴ γε
 τῆς φωνῆς μνημονεύω, φησὶν· “εἰ δὲ οἱ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις
 χρώμενοι καὶ τῷ πλουτεῖν προτιμῶσι τὴν μέθην ταύτην,
 οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν. οὐκ ἔχοντες γὰρ ἑτέραν ἡδονὴν ταύτης
 καλλίω οὐδὲ μᾶλλον εὐχερῇ καταφεύγουσιν εἰκότως 5
 461b ἐπὶ τὸν οἶνον. ὅθεν δὴ καὶ τὰ μεγάλα τῶν ἐκπωμάτων
 ἐπιχώρια γέγονε τοῖς δυνάσταις. οὐδὲ γὰρ παλαιὸν οὐδὲ
 τοῦτό γέ ἐστι παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν, ἀλλὰ νεωστὶ εὐρέθη
 πεμφθὲν ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἀπεστερημένοι
 τῆς παιδείας ὀρμῶσιν ἐπὶ τὸν πολὺν οἶνον καὶ πορίζονται 10
 τροφὰς περιέργους καὶ παντοίας. ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τὴν
 Ἑλλάδα τόποις οὗτ' ἐν γραφαῖς οὗτ' ἐπὶ τῶν πρότερον
 εὐρήσομεν ποτήριον εὐμέγεθες εἰργασμένον πλὴν τῶν ἐπὶ
 τοῖς ἥρωικοῖς. τὸ γὰρ ῥυτὸν ὀνομαζόμενον μόνοις τοῖς
 ἥρωσι ἀπεδίδουσιν. ὃ καὶ δόξει τισὶν ἔχειν ἀπορίαν, εἰ 15
 461c μή τις ἄρα φήσκει διὰ τὴν ὀξύτητα τῆς ἐπιφανείας τῶν
 δαιμόνων καταδειχθῆναι τοῦτο. χαλεποὺς γὰρ καὶ πλήκτας
 τοὺς ἥρωας νομίζουσι καὶ μᾶλλον νύκτωρ ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν.
 ὅπως οὖν μὴ διὰ τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν μέθην φαίνονται
 τοιοῦτοι, δημιουργοῦσιν αὐτοὺς πίνοντας ἐκ πώμασι 20
 μεγάλοις. καὶ μοι δοκοῦσι λέγειν οὐ κακῶς οἱ φάσκοντες
 τὸ μέγα ποτήριον φρέαρ ἀργυροῦν εἶναι”.
 ἐν τούτοις ἀγνοεῖν ἔοικεν ὁ Χαμαιλέων ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶ μικρὸν
 461d τὸ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ διδόμενον τῷ Κύκλωπι ὑπ' Ὀδυσσέως
 κισσύβιον. οὐ γὰρ ἂν τρεῖς πιὼν οὕτως κατηνέχθη ὑπὸ 25
 μέθης τηλικούτος ὢν.

14-15 cf. *Thphr. fr. 575 FHS&G = L 135 Fortenbaugh (ex Ath. Deipn. 11.497e)*
 Θεόφραστος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ μέθης τὸ ῥυτὸν φησιν ὀνομαζόμενον ποτήριον
 τοῖς ἥρωσι μόνοις ἀποδίδεσθαι. 21-25 cf. *Ath. Deipn. 11.461c (locum ad*
Chamaeleontem referendum secundum Kaibel, p. 427 et Lorenzoni², p. 144 –

WINE

On the Recent Use of Large Bowls by Greeks

10 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 11.4 461a-d

Chamaeleon the Heracleot in his work *On Drunkenness*¹ says, if I recall his voice, “if those using their resources prefer this drunkenness even to being wealthy, it is not surprising. Because they have no other pleasure that is either nobler or easier, they understandably flee to wine. Indeed from it the large (bowls) became usual for those in power. This practice is not an old one among the Greeks. It was discovered once it had been sent from the non-Greeks. Those people, because they lack culture, embarked upon drinking a lot of wine and provided for themselves all kinds of elaborate food. But in the places around Greece, neither in paintings nor in earlier (written) sources will we find a sizeable drinking cup made, except in the time of the heroes². For they attributed the cup called the *rhyton* to the heroes alone. That will seem to some to make a problem, unless someone might say that it is because of the swiftness of the appearance of the spirits. For they call the heroes difficult and brawlers, more at night than during the day. So in order that they appear this way not because of their characters but because of drinking, they fashion them as drinking from large cups. And to me those who call the large drinking cup a silver well seem not to be speaking incorrectly.”

In these lines Chamaeleon seems to ignore that the bowl given to the Cyclops by Odysseus in Homer is not small. Because he was so large, he would not have been overcome by drunkenness in this way although he drank three times.

¹ Chamaeleon contributes to a well-attested tradition of writings on *Wine* and *Drunkenness* starting with Aristotle (frr. 99-11 Rose³), and continuing with Theophrastus (frr. 569-579b FHS&G) and Hieronymus of Rhodes (frr. 28-30 White). It is not a coincidence that the issues in Chamaeleon’s texts recur, very similarly if not identically, in those of Theophrastus and Hieronymus (see below, n. 2 and **11**, n. 4). As stated by Wehrli¹, col. 369, the form of Chamaeleon’s *On Drunkenness* was probably dialogic.

² The custom of drinking wine from large bowls was not common in Greek

vd. *infra* fr. *dubium* 56) 25-26 cf. *Eust. Iliad.* 1632.17

3 ταύτην *om. E* 7 οὐδὲ¹ *AE Giangrande* : οὐ *Kaibel* 9 πεμφθὲν *codd.* : μεταπεμφθὲν *dub. Kaibel* 12 τῶν πρότερον *A Giangrande* : ἑπρότερων[†] *Wehrli*, τῶν προτέρων <ἀγαλμάτων> *Giordano*¹ (*coll. Arist. Pol.* 7.17 1336b 15 μήτε ἄγαλμα μήτε γραφήν...), στηλῶν *vel* μνημάτων *add. dub. Kaibel*, ἡρίων *add. dub. Wilamowitz*, ἐπὶ <στηλαῖς> τῶν πρότερον *Steffen* 14 ἡρωικοῖς *codd.* : ἥρωσι *Giordano*¹, ἡρώοις *dub. Kaibel* 22 φαίνονται *EC* : φαίνονται *A*

Cleomenes ex ebrietate furens

Περὶ μέθης

- 11 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.29 427b-c (*BT* vol. 2 p. 429. 8-14 *Kaibel*)

καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι δ', ὥς φησιν Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ
ἔκτῃ, Κλεομένη τὸν βασιλέα Σκύθαις ὁμιλήσαντα καὶ
ἀκρατοπότην γενόμενον ἐκ τῆς μέθης φασὶ μανῆναι. καὶ
αὐτοὶ δ' οἱ Λάκωνες ὅταν βούλωνται ἀκρατέστερον πίνειν,
ἐπισκυθίσαι λέγουσι. Χαμαιλέων γοῦν ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν 5
τῷ περὶ μέθης περὶ τούτων οὕτως γράφει· “ἐπεὶ καὶ
Κλεομένη τὸν Σπαρτιάτην φασὶν οἱ Λάκωνες μανῆναι διὰ
τὸ Σκυθαῖς ὁμιλήσαντα μαθεῖν ἀκρατοποτεῖν. ὅθεν ὅταν
βούλωνται πιεῖν ἀκρατέστερον, ‘ἐπισκύθισον’ λέγουσιν”.

cf. *Herod.* 6.84.1,3 αὐτοὶ δὲ Σπαρτιῆταί φασι ἐκ δαιμονίου μὲν οὐδενὸς
μανῆναι Κλεομένεα, Σκύθησι δὲ ὁμιλήσαντά μιν ἀκρατοπότην γενέσθαι
καὶ ἐκ τούτου μανῆναι. ... Κλεομενέα δὲ λέγουσι ἡκόντων τῶν Σκυθέων
ἐπὶ ταῦτα ὁμιλέειν σφι μεζόνως, ὁμιλέοντα δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ἱκνεομένου
μαθεῖν τὴν ἀκρητοποσίην παρ' αὐτῶν· ἐκ τούτου δὲ μανῆναί μιν
νομίζουσι Σπαρτιῆται. ἐκ τε τούτου, ὥς αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, ἐπεὰν ζωρότερον
βούλωνται πίνειν, “ἐπισκύθισον” λέγουσιν, *unde Eust. Odyss.* 1398.3-5, p.
29.43-45 *Stallbaum* (*ad* α 110) cf. *etiam Hier. Rhod. fr.* 29 *White* (*ex Ath.*
Deipn. 11.499e)

culture, or was admitted only for heroes, who were more violent at night, perhaps because of the wine. The *rhyton* that was granted only to heroes is similarly mentioned in Theophrastus' *Περὶ μέθης* (fr. 575 FHS&G), a passage that confirms the use of analogous examples in more than one treatise about the same topic by different Peripatetics. On this fragment see Fortenbaugh³, in this volume.

Cleomenes Mad because of Drunkenness

11 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.29 427b-c

And the Lacedaemonians, as Herodotus says in book six, say that Cleomenes¹ the king, after associating with Scythians,² became a drinker of unmixed wine and went mad as a result of his drunkenness.³ And the Laconians themselves, whenever they wish to drink something less diluted, say that they do so Scythian style.⁴ Moreover, Chamaeleon the Heracleot in his book *On Drunkenness*⁵ writes as follows about these things: “Since even the Laconians say that Cleomenes the Spartan went mad as a result of learning to drink unmixed wine while associating with Scythians, whenever they wish to drink less diluted wine, they say, ‘do it Scythian style’.”

¹ On Cleomenes, king of Sparta (died c. 489 BC), see *RE* XI.1, s.v. “Kleomenes” (3), coll. 695-792 (Lenschau), and *DNP* 6, s.v. “Kleomenes” (3), coll. 579-80 (K.-W. Welwei).

² Scythians had come to Sparta to seek an alliance against Darius, king of Persia (see Herod. 6.84.2).

³ Like the treatises of other Peripatetics on the same subject, Chamaeleon's evidently stated the most appropriate way to engage in drinking in moderation.

⁴ The case of Cleomenes (cf. Herod. 6.84) should have been used as an example of an attitude of lack of control (see above, n. 3). Note that a similar example of bad foreign influence (in this case Persian) on the way of drinking wine of a Greek king (Alexander) occurs in a passage of Athenaeus (10.434f-435a) not far from this one, attributed to Hieronymus of Rhodes (30 White). In the opinion of Hieronymus (29 White = Ath., *Deipn.* 11.100 499e) the etymology of the word σκύφος can also go back to the Scythians. On this fragment see Fortenbaugh³, in this volume.

⁵ see 10 n. 1.

Oraculum de vino in canicula bibendo

12 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 1.41 22e (BT vol. 1 p. 50.6-11 Kaibel)

11 W οἱ (scil. τραπεζορήτορες) ὑπὸ γλωσσαλγίας ἐπιλελῆσθαι
μοι δοκοῦσι καὶ τοῦ Πυθικοῦ χρησμοῦ, ὃν ἀναγράφει
Χαμαιλέων·

εἴκοσι τὰς πρὸς κυνὸς καὶ εἴκοσι τὰς μετέπειτα
οἴκῳ ἐνὶ σκιερῷ Διονύσῳ χρῆσθαι ἱητρῷ.

cf. *Oenom. Gad. fr. 11b Hammerstaedt* = p. 372 Mullach (ex. *Euseb. Prep. evang. 5.30*) εἴκοσι τὰς πρὸς κυνὸς καὶ εἴκοσι τὰς μετέπειτα | οἴκῳ ἐνὶ
σκιερῷ Διονύσῳ χρῆσθαι ἱητρῷ. Ἀθηναίοις ὑπὸ καύματος ἐνοχλουμένοις·
ἰατρικὸν, ἀλλ' οὐ μαντικόν. *Eust. Iliad. 1632.18* vd. *infra fr. dubium 54* 5

5 χρῆσθαι Kaibel : χρᾶσθαι CE χρῆσθε *Euseb. Prep. evang. 5.30*

Alcaeus quantum biberit

13 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.35 429f-430a (BT vol. 2 p. 435.4-14 Kaibel)

12 W ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεὶ παρεξέβην περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων κράσεων
διαλεγόμενος, ἐπαναλήψομαι τὸν λόγον τὰ ὑπὸ Ἀλκαίου
430a τοῦ μελοποιοῦ λεχθέντα ἐπὶ νοῦν βαλλόμενος· φησὶ γάρ
που οὗτος·

ἔγχεε κέρναις ἓνα καὶ δύο 5

ἐν τούτοις γάρ τινες οὐ τὴν κράσιν οἴονται λέγειν αὐτόν,
ἀλλὰ σωφρονικὸν ὄντα καθ' ἓνα κύαθον ἄκρατον πίνειν
καὶ πάλιν κατὰ δύο. τοῦτο δὲ ὁ Ποντικὸς Χαμαιλέων
ἐκδέδεκται τῆς Ἀλκαίου φιλοινίας ἀπείρως ἔχων. κατὰ
γὰρ πᾶσαν ὥραν καὶ πᾶσαν περίστασιν πίνων ὁ ποιητῆς 10
οὗτος εὐρίσκεται.

vd. *infra fr. dubium 54* 5 *Alcaeus fr. 346.4 Voigt* 9 cf. *Ath. Deipn. 10. 430c*,
ubi Alcaeus dicitur φιλοπότης

2 τὰ ὑπὸ *Casaubon* : τὸν ὑπὸ A 5 ἔγχεε κέρναις ἓνα καὶ δύο *Ahrens coll. Athen. 10.430d et 11.481a* : ἐγχεύε κέρνα εἰς ἓνα A 6 τούτοις *Musurus* : τοῖς A οὐ τὴν A : αὐτὴν *Koepke, Scorza* 7 ἄκρατον *secl. Scorza* 9 ἐκδέδεκται *Schweighäuser* : ἐνδέδεκται A

Oracle on Drinking Wine during the Dog Days

12 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 1.41 22e

They (the table-talkers), as a result of their tongue pain seem to me to have forgotten the Pythian oracle as well, which Chamaeleon records: “for twenty days before the dog star and for twenty days after consult Dionysus as a physician in the shadows of home.”¹

¹ Among the general calls for moderation there is also inserted this fragment, in which Chamaeleon remembers a Pythian oracle that directs the Athenians to use wine as a remedy during the hottest period of the year. That wine might be freely used only as a medical remedy is clear from **14**, which has to be connected also with Ath., *Deipn.* 10.33 429a (**55**), which refers to the legislation of Zaleucus of Locri on this subject, and with Theophrastus 579A FHS&G, in which Zaleucus is said to have applied very restrictive legislation to the drinking of pure wine without a medical prescription: see below, **14** n. 1, and Fortenbaugh³, in this volume.

How much Alcaeus Drank

13 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.35 429f-430a

But since I got off point discussing the old mixtures (of wines), I’ll take up my speech again by calling to mind what the lyric poet Alcaeus said. For he says somewhere, “pour it in by one and two cups.” Some think that he meant in these words not the mixture but, because he was temperate, that he drank by the single ladle,¹ and again by two. The Pontian Chamaeleon has accepted this, although he was unaware of Alcaeus’ wine loving. For in every season and at every occasion this poet is found drinking.

¹ It seems that Chamaeleon misunderstood the real content of the verses of Alcaeus. Trying to present a moderate image of the poet, he believed that the measures were not for the mixing of water and wine – two cups of wine and one of water (see Degani - Burzacchini, p. 233 n. 4) – but for the number of ladles one was allowed to drink. The example of Alcaeus as a *sophronikos* and the probable recognition, even if not accurate in the opinion of Athenaeus of Alcaeus’ love for drinking wine, which is confirmed by Athenaeus’ consideration at the end of the passage, supports attribution of this fragment to the *Περὶ μέθης* (so Koepke, p. 40, and Scorza, pp. 38-39), where moderation was surely indicated as a rule in drinking wine, and not to a monograph on the poet of Mitylene, where the false interpretation would have been too obvious. See Fortenbaugh³, in this volume.

Zaleucus ab Athena leges accipiens

Περὶ μέθης

14 Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.26 170.3 (vol. 1 p. 106.5-7 Stählin)

13W τὸν τε Μίνω παρὰ Διὸς δι' ἐνάτου ἔτους λαμβάνειν τοὺς νόμους ἱστοροῦσι φοιτῶντα εἰς τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἄντρον, τὸν τε αὖ Λυκοῦργον τὰ νομοθετικὰ εἰς Δελφοὺς πρὸς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα συνεχὲς ἀπιόντα παιδεύεσθαι γράφουσι Πλάτων τε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Ἐφορος, Χαμαιλέων τε 5 ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ περὶ μέθης καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Λοκρῶν πολιτείᾳ Ζάλευκον τὸν Λοκρὸν παρὰ τῆς Ἀθηναῖς τοὺς νόμους λαμβάνειν ἀπομνημονεύουσιν.

cf. *Ath. Deipn.* 10.429a παρὰ δὲ Λοκροῖς τοῖς Ἐπιζεφυρίοις, εἴ τις ἄκρατον ἔπιε μὴ προστάξαντος ἱατροῦ θεραπείας ἕνεκα, θάνατος ἦν ἢ ζημία, Ζαλεύκου τὸν νόμον θέντος (*fortasse e Chamaeleontis libro De ebrietate secundum Koepke et Scorza, vd. infra fr. dubium 55*) *Arist. fr.* 548a Rose³ (*e scholiis in Pind. Olymp. 10.17a Drachmann*) Ζάλευκος ... ἐρωτηθεὶς πόθεν εὖροι, ἔφησεν ἐνύπνιον αὐτῷ τὴν Ἀθηναίαν παρίστασθαι. διὸ αὐτός τε ἡλευθέρωται καὶ νομοθέτης κατέστη 1 *Plat. Min.* 319c 3-5 *Arist. fr.* 535 Rose³ 5 *Plat. Legg.* 1.624a, 632d 5-8 *Ephorus FGrHist.* 70 F 174 6-8 *Arist. fr.* 548b Rose³

2 φοιτῶντα *Victorius* : φυτῶντα *L*

HOMERICA

De iis qui de Homeri aetate, genere
et poiesi disseruerunt

15 Tatianus, *Oratio ad Graecos* 31.3 (pp. 57.13-58.4 Marcovich)

14W Περὶ γὰρ τῆς Ὀμήρου ποιήσεως γένους τ' αὐτοῦ καὶ χρόνου καθ' ὃν ἤκμασε προηρεύνησαν πρεσβύτατοι <μέν> Θεαγένης τε ὁ Ῥηγίλινος κατὰ Καμβύσιν γεγωνώς, καὶ Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος καὶ Ἀντίμαχος ὁ Κολοφώνιος Ἡρόδοτός τε ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ 5 Ὀλύνθιος μετὰ <δ> ἐκείνους Ἐφορος ὁ Κυμαῖος καὶ

Zaleucus Gets Laws from Athena

14 Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.26 170.3

They report that Minos received the laws from Zeus every nine years by visiting the cave of Zeus, and Plato, Aristotle, and Ephorus write that Lycurgus learned law-making by often going to Apollo at Delphi, and Chamaeleon the Heracleot in his book *On Drunkenness* and Aristotle in the *Constitution of Locri* note that Zaleucus the Locrian¹ received his laws from Athena.²

¹ The exact context of this fragment is clarified by two fragments of Theophrastus, which show that in Zaleucus' legislation had very restrictive rules about drinking wine without a medical prescription (see Thphr. fr. 579A FHS&G = Ael. *V.H.* 2.37-8 and 579B FHS&G = Ath., *Deipn.* 10.33 429a-b, and 55). This case and many others (see **3A-C**, **8**, **9**, **10**) show that some examples were common among Peripatetic treatises on the same topic.

² See above, **12** n. 1.

HOMERIC STUDIES

On Those Who Discussed Homer's Chronology, Origin and Poetry

15 Tatian, *Oration to the Greeks* 31.3

The oldest writers investigating Homer's poetry, his ethnicity, and the time at which he reached his peak were Theagenes of Rhegium,¹ who lived in the time of Cambyses, Stesimbrotus of Thasos,² Antimachus of Colophon,³ Herodotus of Halicarnassus⁴ and Dionysus of Olynthus.⁵ After them, Ephorus of Cyme,⁶

Φιλόχορος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Μεγακλείδης τε καὶ Χαμαιλέων οἱ Περιπατητικοί· <καὶ> ἔπειτα γραμματικοὶ Ζηνόδοτος, Ἀριστοφάνης, Καλλίστρατος, Κράτης, Ἐρατοσθένης, Ἀρίσταρχος, Ἀπολλόδωρος.

10

Cf. [Plut.] Vita et Poësi Hom. 2-3, pp. 337-38 Bernardakis Clem. Strom. 1.21.117 Aul. Gell. N.A. 3.11,2 (= Philochorus FGrHist 328 F 210) 3 Theagenes 72 A 1 D.-K. 4 Stesimbrotus FGrHist 107 F 21 Antimachus fr. 165 Matthews = 129 Wyss 5 Herod. 2.53 5-6 de Dionysio Olynthio grammatico fere ignoto vide Ucciardello 6 Ephorus FGrHist 70 F 98 cf. Philochorus FGrHist 328 F 211 7 Megacrides fr. 2 Janko 8 Zenodotus p. 54 Duentzer 9 Aristophanes p. 175 Slater Callistrati locum in FGrHist 348 non inveni (si Callimachum legimus – cf. app. – vide fr. 452 Pfeiffer) Crates Mall. fr. 73 Broggiato cf. Eratosthenem FGrHist 241 F 9a-b et vd. Bernhardt, IV (de Chronographiis) p. 240 10 Apollodorus FGrHist 244 F 63

1 τῆς ποιήσεως τοῦ Ὀμήρου *P* 2 πρεσβύτατοι <μέν> *Schwartz ex Eus.* : οἱ πρεσβύτατοι *MVP* 3 Ῥηγί<ν>ος *Otto (post alios) ex Eus.* : ῤήγιος *MVP* 3-4 καὶ Στησίμβροτος *Schwartz ex Eus.* : στησίμβροτός τε *MVP* 4 Ἀντίμαχος *MVP* : Καλλίμαχος *Eus.* 5 Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς *MV* : -ασεὺς *P et Eus.* <δ'> *ex Eus. add. Schwartz* : *om. MVP* 7 καὶ *Gesner, Maran ex Eus.* : ὁ *MVP* 8 καὶ *add. suad. Schwartz* 9 Καλλίστρατος *Wilamowitz, rec. Schwartz* : Καλλίμαχος *MVP et Eus.*

Philochorus of Athens,⁷ and Megacleides⁸ and Chamaeleon the Peripatetics did so,⁹ then the grammarians Zenodotus,¹⁰ Aristophanes,¹¹ Callimachus,¹² Crates,¹³ Eratosthenes,¹⁴ Aristarchus,¹⁵ and Apollodorus.¹⁶

¹ Theagenes of Rhegium, allegorical exegete and biographer of Homer during 6th century BC: see Pontani pp. 25-27.

² Stesimbrotus of Thasos, allegorical exegete and rhapsodist of the 6th-5th century BC: see Pontani, p. 28.

³ Antimachus of Colophon, pupil of Stesimbrotus, poet himself and *grammatikòs*, probably did an edition of Homer's text: see Matthews, pp. 46-51, Pontani p. 33 and bibliography cited there. Biographical data on Homer in Antimachus' fragments are in 166a-c Matthews = 130a-c Wyss.

⁴ Herodotus mentions Homer's biographical data in 2.53, where he dates the poet to four hundred years before himself; in 2.117, Herodotus expresses an opinion on the inauthenticity of the *Cypria*, and in 4.32 he is doubtful about the attribution of *Hyperboreans*.

⁵ On this grammarian (perhaps of the 5th-4th century BC: the only text that can be used for his chronology is Tatian's, but the chronological order in this passage is uncertain), whose name is still doubtful in two fragments, the information is limited. He was probably interested in Homer and in prosody; see Ucciardello.

⁶ The Suda's entry on Ephorus (s.v. *Ephippos*: see *FGrHist* 328 T1) says that, "he wrote from the time of the sack of Ilium and the Trojan affairs down to his own time in 30 books": no other evidence about works relating to Homer is offered, but in *FrGHist* 328 F99 (*Vit. Hom. Rom.* p. 30.27 Wil.) Ephorus is quoted on Homer's birth (Cyme), in F101 (Aul. Gell. 3.11.2) he is said to have believed that Homer was younger than Hesiod and in F102b (Hieronym. *Chron.* p. 77.16 Helm) Homer's acme is put at the same time as that of the Latin king Agrippa.

⁷ Among Philochorus' works cited in the Suda there are some evidently devoted to literary themes (see *FGrHist* 328 T1: *On Alcman*, *On Euripides*, *On the Plots of Sophocles*) and we know also a *Composition on Tragedies* (see *FGrHist* 328 F90), there is no evidence about a work dedicated to Homer. Information on the chronology of the poet (he was older than Hesiod), about his origin (he came from Argos), and about his acme (during the archonship of Archippos) is contained in F209 (*Vit. Hom. Rom.*, p. 31.1 Wil.), F210 (Aul. Gell. *N.A.* 3.11.2) and F211 (Tatian, *Ad gr.* 31 – Euseb. *P.E.* 10.11.4 – and Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.117.1), but Jacoby (*Komm.*, p. 277) suggests for them a provenance from a chronological work, the *Olympiads*, two books and says that "we cannot prove that Ph[ilochorus] went into the particulars of Homer's life as he did in regard to Euripides."

⁸ On Megacleides, Peripatetic of the 3th century BC, author of a *On Homer* in which he also discussed biographical data, see Pontani, pp. 38-39.

⁹ Chamaeleon is mentioned among those who deal with biographical research on Homer. This notice may have some credibility (see Heraclides of Pontus, fr. 1.92 Schütrumpf = 176 Wehrli and 105 Schütrumpf = 177 Wehrli: Heraclides plagiarized Chamaeleon's studies on Homer, and a fragment of Heraclides certifies

Heraclides Ponticus furatur Chamaeleontis
studia de Homero et Hesiodo

16 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 5.92 (BT vol. 1 p. 373.2-4 Marcovich)

23 W=46 Χαμαιλέων τε τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῷ φησι κλέψαντα αὐτὸν
(*scil.* Ἡρακλείδην) τὰ περὶ Ἡσιόδου καὶ Ὀμήρου γράψαι.

Heracl. Pont. fr. 1.92 Schütrumpf = 176 Wehrli, cf. etiam Heracl. Pont. fr. 105

the chronological primacy of Homer over Hesiod). After Aristotle, Megacledes and Chamaeleon are actually the most cited Peripatetics in scholia to the *Iliad*, although they are not the only ones to concern themselves with Homer (Theophrastus, Heraclides of Pontus, Hieronymus of Rhodes and Demetrius of Phalerum did the same); their works, then, though often criticized, had to be taken into account by later editors and commentators of the poet. The list proposed by Tatian does not allow us to say with certainty that among Chamaeleon's writings there was one explicitly titled *On Homer* (despite the testimony of Diogenes Laertius, see **16**) or that this or these writings dealt with all the matters to which Tatian alludes (poetry, ethnicity, acme). It is true that research on historical and biographical data suits Chamaeleon, but all the fragments we have, which come from different *corpora* of scholia on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, refer to matters directly relating to Homeric poetry. See Mirhady and Schorn², in this volume.

¹⁰ On Zenodotus, first librarian of Alexandria in the 3rd century BC, perhaps author of a *Life of Homer* and of an edition of the poet, but not of a commentary, see Pontani, pp. 43-44 and bibliography cited there.

¹¹ On Aristophanes of Byzantium, librarian in Alexandria between the 3rd and 2nd century BC, author of a Homeric edition, see Pontani, pp. 48-49. None of his fragments contains biographical data on Homer.

¹² The poet Callimachus, 3rd century BC, does not seem to have dedicated systematic writings on Homer. See Pontani, p. 46.

¹³ We know two treatises of Crates of Mallos (2nd century BC) on Homer, the *Diorthotika* and the *Homerica*, containing textual and exegetic notes. See Pontani pp. 52-54.

¹⁴ Eratosthenes, librarian in Alexandria after Apollonius of Rhodes, wrote a treatise of uncertain title on Homer: see Pontani p. 46 and Di Gregorio, p. 72 and n. 8, and bibliography quoted there.

¹⁵ Aristarchus of Samothrace, librarian in Alexandria after Apollonius Eidographus in the 2nd century BC, probably did two editions of Homer and wrote perhaps two commentaries on the poems. See Pontani, pp. 50-51.

¹⁶ Apollodorus of Athens, pupil of Aristarchus, was the author of many treatises related in some way to Homeric poems, (besides the *Zetemata grammatikà* on a book of the *Iliad*, his *Peri theôn* began with analysis of the names of gods in Homer): see Pontani p. 54.

Heraclides Plagiarizes Chamaeleon's Studies on Homer and Hesiod

16 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.92

And Chamaeleon says that Heraclides wrote his books about Hesiod and Homer¹ after stealing the material from him.²

¹ Of the many titles of works of Heraclides dedicated to Homer (see Diog. Laert. 5.87-8 = fr. 1 Schütrumpf), only one associates the names of both poets:

Schütrumpf = fr. 177 Wehrli : Ἡρακλείδης μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν (*scil.* Ὅμηρον) ἀποδείκνυσι πρεσβύτερον Ἡσιόδου.

1 χαμελέων *BF* τὰ *om. F* ἑαυτοῦ *Cobet*

Ad Iliadem

Περὶ Ἰλιάδος

17 *Schol. vet. in Apoll. Rhod. Argonautica* 2.904-910a (pp. 193.21-194.6 Wendel)

²²W ὅτι δὲ ἐπολέμησεν Ἰνδοὺς ὁ Διόνυσος, Διονύσιός φησι καὶ Ἀριστόδημος ἐν α' Θηβαικῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων καὶ Κλείταρχος ἐν ταῖς περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον ἱστορίαις, προσιστορῶν ὅτι καὶ Νύσα ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν Ἰνδικῇ καὶ κισσῷ προσόμοιον φυτὸν φυτεύεται ἐκεῖ, ὃ προσαγορεύεται σκινδαψός. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Χαμαιλέων ἱστόρησεν ἐν ε' 5 περὶ Ἰλιάδος.

ad Hom. Iliad. Z 132-133 ὅς ποτε μαινομένοιο Διωνύσοιο τιθήνας / σεῦε κατ' ἡγάθεον Νυσήϊον... *cf. schol. D in Hom. Z 133 van Thiel Strabonem*

On the Age of Homer and Hesiod (Diog. Laert. 5.87). Although we have some evidence that suggests a treatise of Chamaeleon on Homer, we have none for his studies on Hesiod. A tradition of studies on Hesiod in the Peripatos was begun by Aristotle himself, whose *Aporhemata Hesiodou in one book* is known from the list of his works handed down by Hesychius (see Rose³, p. 16). Near the same period as Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes of Mitylene and probably Hieronymus of Rhodes dedicated attention to the poet of Ascra (see Hieronymus of Rhodes 45 White and Praxiphanes **28A-B** Matelli, in this volume). It is not impossible that Chamaeleon himself devoted some attention to Hesiod's life or works.

² If Heraclides had the opportunity to steal something from Chamaeleon's writings on Homer and Hesiod (even if we believe, like Gottshalk, p. 2, that this plagiarism was something like "a storm in a local Literary Society"), we must assume that, at the time he composed his treatises on the two poets, Heraclides could have had a copy of Chamaeleon's writings or he knew in another way his opinion. Chamaeleon, then, before the death of Heraclides (which happened in 310 BC – on Heraclides' chronology see Gottshalk, pp. 4-5), was already able to develop his own ideas of literary criticism, and this idea was worthy of some consideration. I do find credible the reconstruction proposed by Gottschalk, p. 2, which assumes that Heraclides of Pontus went back to Heraclea after the death of the scholarch Speusippus, in 339 BC, and had some pupils there, including, perhaps, the young Chamaeleon. From Heraclea Chamaeleon moved to Athens, probably during the years between the deaths of Aristotle (322 BC) and Heraclides (310 BC), and there he began to attend the school of Aristotle under the direction of Theophrastus. From Athens he came back to Heraclea, where we find him at the end of 281 BC (see **1** and Wehrli¹, coll. 368-69).

On the *Iliad*

17 Scholium on Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* 2.904-910a

Dionysius and Aristodemus, in the first book of *Theban Epigrams*, and Clitarchus, in the *Researches Concerning Alexander*, say that Dionysus waged war on the Indians, adding to their research that Nysa is a mountain in India and that a plant similar to ivy grows there, which is called *skindapsus*. Chamaeleon¹ also gives an account of that² in book five³ *On the Iliad*.

¹ Chamaeleon's notice probably refers to *Iliad* 6.132-33 (see app. loc. par. and scholia ad loc.): so Koepke, p. 18.

² See Mirhady, in this volume.

³ Chamaeleon wrote a treatise *On the Iliad* in at least five books (see also **20**). It is hard to say what the shape of this work was. It seems to be a set of disparate observations on the poetry of the epic, probably collected according to theme

216 **Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea**

15.1.7-8 *Serv. ad Verg. Aen. 6.805 Nysae de vertice: mons est Indiae, de quo loquitur. ceterum est Nysa civitas, in qua Liber colitur, unde Nysaeus dictus est* 1 *Dionysius Schyt. FGrHist 32 F13* 2 *Aristodemus FGrHist 383 F1* 3 *Clitarchus FGrHist 137 F17*

1 κατεπολέμησε *F* Ἰνδοῖς *P* 3 Ἀλεξάνδρου *F*

18 **Schol. A ad Hom. M 231a (vol. 3 p. 347.2-4 Erbse)**

16W Πουλυδάμα· αἱ Ἀριστάρχου χωρὶς τοῦ ν̄, παρὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν. Ζηνόδοτος δὲ καὶ Χαμαιλέων σὺν τῷ ν̄, Πο<υ>λυδάμαν.

Didymus p. 342.4-6 Ludwich (cf. etiam p. 26 adn. 9 Lehrs) cf. schol. A ad Hom. Σ 285b et schol. T ad Hom. Ξ 470 Choerob. schol. in Theod. Alex. Can. isagog. 115.7 et 131.17 Hilgard

3 Πο<υ>λυδάμαν *Villoison* : πολυδάμαν *A*

rather than as a progressive analysis of the entire text of the poem: that view is suggested by the fact that a note on the 21st book of the *Iliad* was in the first book of the treatise, while a note on a verse from the 6th book was in the fifth. On other observations on this book see above, **18** n. 3.

18 Scholium on Homer, *Iliad* 12.231

“Polydama”: the (editions) of Aristarchus¹ (are) without the n, contrary to analogy; but Zenodotus² and Chamaeleon³ (write it) with the n, “Polydaman.”⁴

¹ The plural αἱ Ἀριστάρχου can probably refer to the two editions made by the scholar (see above, **15** n. 15).

² On Zenodotus’ criticism of Homer see above, **15** n. 10.

³ This textual observation comes to our scholia from the *On the Recension of Aristarchus* of Didymus and shows the reading attested in Aristarchus’ editions against the one known as Chamaeleon’s and Zenodotus’. Chamaeleon’s reading could go back to a personal intervention of Didymus, who was certainly familiar with various writings of the Heracleot (see **3A**). But, on the basis of recent studies relating to the method and the characteristics of Alexandrian Homeric *ekdoseis*, and Aristarchus’ ones in particular (Montanari¹⁻⁴), in which scholars ‘collated’ many Homeric editions available to them, noting, where they wanted, the variants they found there (which will not then refer at all to Didymus’ personal intervention – see Montanari³), it is not inconceivable that Aristarchus himself was criticizing, in the margin of his edition, the (perhaps tacit) issue of Zenodotus and Chamaeleon. Of the latter, if we do not want to risk, as does Lehrs, p. 26 n. 2, the hypothesis of a personal recension of Chamaeleon (see Wehrli¹, col. 370), Aristarchus could very likely see his studies *On the Iliad* (of this opinion Erbse, app. crit. to scholium 231a [18]: “Chamaeleontem Homeri carmina non edidisse, sed de singulis locis in libris De Iliade et De Odyssea egisse paene constat. Quos iam ab Aristarcho adhibitos esse putaverim”). If so, we would still have to question the nature of these fragments: since those in our possession show traces of readings ‘attested’ in Chamaeleon but not of any contrary hypothesis (see **18**, **19**, **21A-B**, **24**), it is probable that the *Iliad* treatise did not include discussions of variants, but the Homeric text was given perhaps in long passages (from which the Alexandrians drew Chamaeleon’s lessons) only in connection with the passages that aroused Chamaeleon’s interest. And in fact it is certain that these books contain allegorizing exegesis (**20**), geographical curiosities relating Homeric exegesis (**19**), mythological information (**23**), and reviews of various kinds (**22A-B**).

⁴ See Mirhady, in this volume.

218 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

19 Schol. T ad Hom. T 62c, (vol. 4 p. 585.67-69 Erbse)

17W ἀπομηνίσαντος· ὑφ' ἑν. ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ, ὡς
“Πριάμῳ ἐπεμήνιε δῖῳ”. ἡ παντελῶς μηνίσαντος. Χαμαιλέων
δὲ γράφει ἐπιμηνίσαντος.

cf. schol. T ad Hom. Iliad. H 230 ἀπομηνίσας· Ἀρίσταρχος “ἐπιμηνίσας” 2
Hom. Iliad. N 460

Περὶ τῆς Ἰλιάδος

20 Schol. Genav. in Hom. Φ 390b, (vol. 5 p. 218.60-64 Erbse = Φ 390 Nicole)

18W <γηθοσύνη, ὅθ' ——— ξυνιόντας> Χαμαιλέων ἐν α' Περὶ
τῆς Ἰλιάδος μέμφεται τὸ ἐθελόκακον τοῦ Διὸς καὶ φησιν·
“ὥσπερ εἰ τι καλὸν ὁρῶ, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν μεγίστην ἀτοπίαν.
ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι περὶ ἀρετῆς ἡμιλλῶντο· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν
θνητοὶ ἵνα κινδυνεύσωσιν”.

5

cf. schol. Genav. in Hom. Φ 390a Erbse, vol. 5, pp. 217-218 Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν
Ἀπορήμασι ζητεῖ πῶς τῷ Ἄρει ἐπιπλήξας ὅτι αὐτῷ “ἔρις <τε> φίλον
πολεμοί τε” (Hom. Iliad. E 891), οὗτος γέγηθεν ἐπὶ τούτοις· φησὶ δὲ
ὅτι ὁρθῶς ἐπιτιμᾷ τῷ Ἄρει· οὐ γὰρ <ὅτι ἔριδι> ἔχαιρεν ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ,
φιλόμαχος· οὐδὲ οἰνόφλυξ ὅστις χαίρει οἴνῳ, ἀλλ' ὅτι αἰεὶ καὶ σφόδρα
vide Arist. Ἀπορήματα Ὀμηρικά fr. 142-179 Rose³

1 Χαμαιλέων – κινδυνεύσωσιν cum scholio 390a coniunxit Ge, distinxit
Nicole, probavit Erbse 2 ἄ Ge : πρώτη Erbse 3 ὁρῶ Ge
: ὁρῶν Erbse, ἑώρα Nicole

19 Scholium on Homer, *Iliad* 19.62c

“Venting anger” (*apomenisantos*): under one word, but the *apo* instead of *epi*, as in “he directed anger (*epemenie*) at divine Priam” (*Il.* 13.460) or, in general, “having anger” (*menisantos*). Chamaeleon writes, “directing anger at” (*epimenisantos* – *Il.* 13.460).¹

¹ As in **18** we read again a textual choice and a variant of Chamaeleon (because of the synonymy between *epimenisas* and *apomenisas*, see Lorenzoni², p. 145). This reading (on which see Mirhady, in this volume) probably appeared in Aristarchus’ edition and was received in Homeric scholia once again through the *On the Recension of Aristarchus* of Didymus (see Erbse ad loc. and scholium to 8.230: see Koepke, p. 17 and, therein mentioned, Lehrs, p. 118).

20 Scholium on Homer, *Iliad* 21.390b

Chamaeleon¹ in the first book² *On the Iliad* criticizes the cowardice of Zeus and says, “just as if I saw something good, but not the greatest oddity. One must say that they were quarreling about excellence; for they were not mortal and running some risk.”³

Sch. Genav. to *Iliad* 21.390a before Chamaeleon’s fragment: “Aristotle in the *Objections* examines how, having attacked Ares because to him “strife and wars are dear” (*Il.* 5.891), (Zeus) himself is delighted by them. He says, «he is right to criticize Ares; not because he enjoyed battles, but because he did it continuously (he’s called) battle-lover; nor alcoholic is just someone who enjoys wine, but (someone who) enjoys it all the time and excessively.”

¹ On textual problems concerning this scholium and previous editions see Giangrande, pp. 164-65.

² See above **17** n. 2

³ Chamaeleon, probably took up an issue already identified by Aristotle, who tried to find agreement between two passages of the *Iliad* (5.891 and 21.390) that seemed contradictory. In the first Zeus rails against Ares because he was always fond of war and strife, but in the second he is pleased to see the gods fall into contention. Aristotle justifies Zeus through a lexical notation: Ares is *philomachos*; he loves war and contention continuously, and because of that Zeus has good reason to blame him, “considerato che Zeus non era da biasimare perché gli piaceva combattere solo quando l’occasione lo richiedeva” (Giangrande, p. 165). It does not seem that Chamaeleon is criticizing the cowardice of the god revealed by Aristotle (Giangrande, p. 166); it seems to me rather that he finds another

21A *Schol. A in Hom. Ψ 94, (vol. 5 p. 384.68-71 Erbse)*

^{19W} ἡθείη κεφαλὴ· προσφώνησις νέου πρὸς πρεσβύτερον· δῆλον <οὖν> ὅτι πρεσβύτερος Ἀχιλλέως ὁ Πάτροκλος. Χαμαιλέων γράφει ὦ θείη κεφαλὴ, γελοῖον δὲ ἐπὶ νεκρῷ τὸ “ὦ θείη”· διὸ ἡ διπλῇ.

Aristonic. Iliad. p. 327 Friedlaender cf. schol. in Hom. K 37 et Z 518b (ex Herodiano Aristarchum de accentibus adducente) Choerob. Ortograph., Anecd. Ox. II, p. 216.33-34 Cramer Anon. περὶ ποσότητος, Anecd. Ox. II, p. 284.20-21 Cramer 3 Didymus p. 483 Ludwich

1 *le. A* : ἡθείη *T* 2 δῆλον ὅτι πρεσβύτερος *bis in A, em. Villoison* οὖν *add. Dindorf* 3 κεφαλὴ *om. T* 4 ὦ *om. T*

21B *Eust. ad Hom. Ψ 94 (vol. 4 p. 692.15-20 Van der Valk)*

ἡθεία δὲ κεφαλὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἡθείος γίνεται, περὶ οὗ πολλαχοῦ δεδήλωται, Χαμαιλέοντος δέ, φασί, τοῦ γραμματικοῦ, γράψαντος “ὦ θείη κεφαλὴ”, μέμφονται οἱ παλαιοί. ἡθεῖον μὲν γὰρ ὀνομάσαι ἀδελφικῶς τὸν προγενέστερον φίλον εἶη ἂν καλόν. τὴν δὲ τοῦ θείου πρόσρησιν, οἷον “θεῖος 5 ὄνειρος” καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, οὐ τῷ τυχόντι διδόναι χρή, καὶ μάλιστα νεκρῷ ἀπλῶς.

1-2 *cf. Eust. Iliad. 659.45ss. et 50-52* 5-6 τὴν δὲ – χρή *verba ipsius Eustathii secundum Van der Valk*

22A *Schol. B in Hom. Ψ 454b, (vol. 5 p. 437.34-38 Erbse)*

^{20W} ὅς τὸ μὲν ἄλλο τόσον <φοῖνιξ ἦν>· τόσον ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅλον· οὕτω γάρ φησι πρὸς τὰ παρ’ ὀλίγον τετελεσμένα. οἱ δὲ Γλωσσογράφοι τόσον ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸ σῶμα. Χαμαιλέων δέ φησι τοὺς τοιούτους ἵππους ἀρίστους εἶναι.

Ariston. p. 332 Friedländer cf. schol. T in Hom. Σ 378b Erbse (ex. + Ariston.,

justification for the pleasure experienced by Zeus in the contention between gods, because it brings into play only their honor and not their lives (see Giordano², p. 141 and Giangrande, pp. 165-66). See also Mirhady, in this volume.

21A Scholium on Homer, *Iliad* 23.94

“Honored head” (*etheie kephale*): greeting of a young man toward an older man; so it is clear that Patroclus is older¹ than Achilles. Chamaeleon writes, “Oh divine (*theie*) head,”² but it is ridiculous to say to a corpse, “oh divine.” Therefore the *diplé*.³

¹ On the length of Achilles over Patroclus see *Iliad* 11.787.

² On Chamaeleon’s reading see Mirhady, in this volume.

³ The section of this scholium that explains the presence in the margin of the *diplé*, the critical sign used to indicate a section of the text worthy of attention, comes, according to the editor Erbse, from Aristonicus’ *Peri semeion Iliados*; the section on the textual variant, however, comes from Didymus’ *On the Recension of Aristarchus*, although Friedländer, p. 327, assigns the whole passage to Aristonicus. On the manner in which Chamaeleon’s variant came into the Homeric commentary, see above **18** n. 3.

21B Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer Iliad* 23.94

“*etheia kephale* comes from the word *etheios* (“honored”), concerning which it has been made clear in many places, but the old (commentators),¹ they say, have criticized Chamaeleon the grammarian, who has written, *o theie kephale*. The form of address *theios* (“divine”), such as “divine dream” and so on, must not be given to someone by chance, and especially not to someone who is dead.

22A Scholium on Homer, *Iliad* 23.454b

“So much” (*toson*), instead of “entirely”, for in this way he speaks with regard to things varying in a small way. The writers of *glôssai* (say) “so much” (*toson*) instead of “body” (*soma*). And Chamaeleon says that such horses are best.¹

¹ As in **17**, **20** and **23**, this scholium does not refer to a textual variant but relates a comment of Chamaeleon on a Homeric passage (on which see Mirhady, in this volume). In fact, only the last line of the passage has to be referred to him

222 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

cf. Ariston. p. 287 Friedländer) schol. D in Hom. Ψ 454 van Thiel Ap. Soph. Lex. Hom. s.v. φοῖνιξ p. 164.29 Bekker (v.l. δέμας pro τόσον)

1 *le. T supplevit Erbse : om. b* 3 τόσον *b* 3 τὸ *om. b*

22B Eust. ad Hom. Ψ 455, (vol. 4 p. 763.15-16 Van der Valk)

ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τοὺς τοιούτους ἵππους ἀρίστους ὁ Χαμαιλέων ἱστορεῖ, ὥς φασιν οἱ Ὑπομνηματισταί.

23 Schol. vet. in Apoll. Rhod. Argonautica 1.139-144a (p. 19.4-7 Wendel)

15 W Ἰδμων δ' ὑστάτ<ιος>. Χαμαιλέων φησὶ τὸν Θέστορα Ἰδμονα παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις καλεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ἔμπειρον εἶναι, ἄλλοι φασὶ καὶ Θέστορα συμπλεῦσαι τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις.

cf. Hom. Iliad. A 69 Κάλχας Θεστορίδης, οἰωνοπόλων ὅχ' ἄριστος locum primus Koepke adduxit.

2 ἔμπειρον <μαντικῆς> *dub. Jacoby*

Ad Odysseam

24A Schol. H P Q ad Hom. ε 334 (vol. 1 p. 278.8-10 Dindorf)

21a W ὁ μὲν Ἀριστοφάνης τὰς ἀνθρωποειδεῖς θεὰς αὐδηέσσας φησὶν οἶονεὶ φωνὴν μετειληφυίας, ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης οὐδῆεσσαν λέγει οἶονεὶ ἐπίγειον· οὕτως καὶ Χαμαιλέων.

*Aristoph. Byz. p. 197 Slater cf. schol. EPQT in Hom. Od. ε 334 Dindorf ζητεῖ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης (fr. 171a Rose³), διὰ τί τὴν Καλυψὶν καὶ τὴν Κίρκην καὶ τὴν Ἰνώ αὐδηέσσας λέγει μόνας· πᾶσαι γὰρ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι φωνὴν εἶχον. καὶ λῦσαι μὲν οὐ βεβούληται, μεταγράφει δὲ ποτὲ μὲν εἰς τὸ αὐλήεσσα, ἐξ οὗ δηλοῦσθαί φησιν ὅτι μονώδεις ἦσαν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Ἰνοῦς οὐδῆεσσα. τοῦτο γὰρ πᾶσαις ὑπῆρχεν αὐταῖς καὶ μόναις· πᾶσαι γὰρ αὗται ἐπὶ γῆς ὤκουν *nec non schol. H in Hom. κ 136 αὐδήεσσα· Ἀριστοτέλης οὐδῆεσσα (fr. 171c Rose³) Et.M. 169.10-12 Gaisford 2 Arist. fr. 171b Rose³**

3 οὐδῆεσσαν *Buttmann coll. Eust. in Hom. Od. ε 334 et schol. Hom. Od. κ 136 : αὐδήεσσαν codd.*

and not the entire lexical discussion. The origin of this scholium is not clear. The section about the *glossographoi* should come from Aristonicus (see Erbse app. ad 454a; of this opinion Friedländer, p. 332), and this strange information of Chamaeleon about horses could also occur in his *Peri semeiôn Iliados*.

22B Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer Iliad* 23.455

It is necessary to know that Chamaeleon reports that such horses are best, as the commentators say.

23 Scholium on Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* 1.139-144a

And Idmon last. Chamaeleon says that the ancients called Thestor "Idmon"¹ (as a nickname) because he was experienced, but others say that Thestor sailed along with the Argonauts.

¹ No other ancient source suggests the association of the name of Idmon with Thestor, although the scholium mentions that Chamaeleon extracted this information from unidentified ancient sources. For Pherecydes (*FGrHist* 3 F 108, the same scholium to Apoll. Rhod. 1.139 where we find Chamaeleon quoted) both were brothers on their father's side (Apollo), but not their mother's side: the first was in fact son of Laotoe (and had as his putative father Abas), the second the son of Asteria. Of these, only Idmon participated to the expedition of the Argonauts, and the fact that someone believed that Thestor did so was probably the reason to push the Peripatetic to identify the two. On this fragment see Mirhady, in this volume.

On the *Odyssey*

24A Scholium on Homer, *Odyssey* 5.334

Aristophanes¹ says that the anthropomorphic goddesses speak after having changed their voice, but Aristotle says that "earthly" (*oudêessan*) means the same thing as "terrestrial." So does Chamaeleon.²

¹ On Aristophanes of Byzantium's edition of Homer see **15** n. 11.

² The fragment refers to a reading of Aristophanes of Byzantium, as opposed to a misreading of Aristotle, which Chamaeleon followed (on which see Mirhady, in this volume). We can ask whether we know Aristotle's reading as a result of Chamaeleon's work or if Aristophanes compared Aristotle's text with the one of Chamaeleon. We cannot say whether it was a treatise on Homeric themes. The existence itself of an *On the Odyssey* corresponding to the well known *On the Iliad* is uncertain (see Wehrli¹, col 370). This fragment may allow us to reconstruct it, but we can say nothing more, even whether

24B Eust. ad Hom. ε 334, 1543.50 (p. 228.28-32 Stallbaum)

21b W αὐδήεσσα δέ, ἥ ἢ διαβόητος κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς ὁ
ἐστὶν ἀοίδιμος διὰ τὰ ἐπ’ αὐτῇ συμβάντα, ἥ ἢ ἔνδοξος,
εὐγενὴς γάρ· ἥ κατὰ Ἀριστοφάνην, ἥ χρωμένη ἀνθρωπίνη
φωνῇ· οὕτω γὰρ αὐδήεντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς διαστολὴν
τῶν λοιπῶν ζώων. γράφεται δὲ καὶ οὐδήεσσα, τουτέστιν 5
ἐπίγειος. νύμφη γὰρ ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανίωνων.
Ἀριστοτέλους δέ φασι καὶ Χαμαιλέοντος ἡ τοιαύτη γραφή.

Hunc Eustathii locum inter Aristotelis (cf. fr. 171a-c Rose³) et Aristophanis (cf. Aristoph. Byz. p. 197 Slater) fragmenta non inveni

HESIODEA

25 Cf. 16

23 W = 46

ALCMAN

De inventione musicae

26 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.43 389f-390a (BT vol. 2 p. 350.3-14 Kaibel)

24 W καλοῦνται δ’ οἱ πέρδικες ὑπ’ ἐνίων κακκάβαι, ὥς καὶ
390a ὑπ’ Ἀλκμᾶνος λέγοντος οὕτως·
 Ἔπη τάδε καὶ μέλος Ἀλκμᾶν
 εὔρε γεγλωσσαμέναν
 κακκαβίδων ὅπα συνθέμενος 5
 σαφῶς ἐμφανίζων ὅτι παρὰ τῶν περδίκων ᾄδειν
ἐμάνθανε. διὸ καὶ Χαμαιλέον ὁ Ποντικὸς ἔφη τὴν εὔρεσιν
τῆς μουσικῆς τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐπινοηθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν
ταῖς ἐρημίαις ἀδόντων ὀρνίθων· ὧν κατὰ μίμησιν λαβεῖν
σύστασιν τὴν μουσικήν. οὐ πάντες δ’ οἱ πέρδικες, φησί, 10
κακκαβίζουσιν.

this hypothetical treatise was in at least five books (see Giordano², p. 134). The fragment seems to reach the scholia on the *Odyssey* through Porphyry: so Pontani, p. 39, according to Schrader, p. 58, 8-10. But this may be one of those cases indicated by the editor in his introduction to the edition of the *Odyssey* scholia, in which one can rightly ask the question whether “e Porphirio an ex aliis commentariis, quibus ipse Porphyrius usus sit, fluxerit.”

24B Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer*, *Odyssey* 5.334

audêessa (speaking) means either “famous”, according to the old commentators, that is, “sung about”, because of what happened to her, or “reputed”, for she was noble, or, according to Aristophanes, that she used a human voice; for in this way humans speak, in distinction from other animals. But it is also written *oudêessa* (earthly), that is, terrestrial; for she was a young woman and not one of the celestial goddesses. This is the text, they say, of Aristotle and Chamaeleon¹.

¹ Eustathius has more options than one can find in **24A**: so he either read a wider version, or combined different information.

HESIODIC STUDIES

25 see 16

ALCMAN

Alcman’s Invention of Music

26 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.43 389f-390a

Partridges are called *kakkabai*¹ by some, such as Alcman, who says, “Alcman discovered epic and lyric by arranging the voices of articulate partridges,”² showing clearly that he learned about singing from the partridges. Therefore Chamaeleon the Pontine² also said that the invention of music was conceived by the ancients to be from the birds singing in the wild; so music gained a basis from imitation.” But not all partridges, he says, make the sound *kakkabê*³.

¹ For the invention of music from imitation of natural sounds, the poet Alcman’s awareness of the phenomenon, and the textual problems of these

3-5 *Alcman fr. 39 Davies* = 91 *Calame* = 4F3 *Lanata* cf. *etiam fr. 40 Davies* = 140 *Calame (cum commentario p. 548)* = 4F4 *Lanata nec non Anth. Pal. 9.184*

3 *φέπη* τάδε *Page dub.*, *ἔπη* τάδε *Emperius, Bergk* : *ἐπηγε* δὲ *A*, *ἔπη* δέ γε *Diehl, prob. Calame*, *ἔπη* δέ τε *Hartung, Wilamowitz* *φέπη* δὲ καὶ *etiam tempt. Wilamowitz; alii alia (vid. Calame pp. 116-17)* 4 εὔρε γεγλωσσαμέναν *Marzullo (sed γεγλωσσαμέναν tanquam glossema delet)* : εὔρετε γλωσσαμένον *A*, εὔρε γεγλωσσαμένον *Meineke*, εὔρέ τε γλώσσα νόμον *Hermann* 5 ὄπα *Schneidewin* : ὄνομα *A*, στόμα *Emperius* 9 ὦν κατὰ *Musurus* : ὦν τὴν κατὰ *A* 10 σύστασιν *Wilamowitz* : στάσιν *A*

De Alcmane carminum eroticorum inventore

27 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.75 600f-601a (*BT* vol. 3 p. 324.8-22 Kaibel)

25W Ἀρχύτας δ' ὁ ἀρμονικός, ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων, Ἀλκμᾶνα γεγονέναι τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν ἡγεμόνα καὶ ἐκδοῦναι πρῶτον μέλος ἀκόλαστον, ὄντα καὶ περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην μούσαν εἰς τὰς διατριβάς. διὸ καὶ λέγειν ἐν τινι τῶν μελῶν· 5

Ἔρως με δηῦτε Κύπριδος *φέκατι*
γλυκὺς κατεΐβων καρδίαν ἰαίνει.

λέγει δὲ καὶ ὥς τῆς Μεγαλοστράτης οὐ μετρίως ἐρασθεῖς,
601a ποιητρίας μὲν οὔσης, δυναμένης δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν ὁμιλίαν
τοὺς ἐραστὰς προσελκύσασθαι. λέγει δὲ οὕτως περὶ αὐτῆς· 10
τοῦτο *Φαδειᾶν* ἔδειξε *Μωσᾶν*
δῶρον μάκαιρα παρσένων
ἅ ξανθὰ Μεγαλοστράτα.

vd. infra fr. dubium 58 1-2 *Sud.lex. a* 1289.26 *Adler s.v.* Ἀλκμάν ... καὶ ὦν

verses, see the introduction and the commentary to this fragment in Degani-Burzacchini, p. 285-86, Schorn¹, pp. 54-55 and Id.², in this volume.

² Koepke assigned the fragment, which follows explanation attributed to Clearchus and precedes one assigned to Theophrastus (355B FHS&G), to the *Protrepticus*, to the title of which he added *On Music* (see 4, n. 2). Since Wendling, col. 2104 (Scorza, pp. 8-9, Wehrli², pp. 78-79, Seffen, p. 46, Giordano², pp. 147-148), however, the fragment has otherwise been assigned to an unknown *Περὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος*. If there is an analogy with the so called ‘method of Chamaeleon’ (on which see Schorn², in this volume), which appears in biographical fragments relating to other poets, there may be good reason to accept the idea of a monograph on Alcman. On the other hand, we can not exclude the possibility that these fragments occurred elsewhere (see Marzullo, p. 297 n. 2, who assigned them to the treatise *Περὶ ἡδονῆς*; we can, however, suppose a book dedicated to music, since the passage quoted by Athenaeus refers to Chamaeleon’s view on the invention of music – see Comotti, pp. 20-21, Gentili, p. 70 and n. 17).

³ For the interpretation of this remark of Chamaeleon, see Schorn¹, pp. 53-54: “so ist zu folgern, daß er entweder die These von der Entstehung des Gesangs durch Nachahmung der Vögel am Exempel Alkmans dargelegt hat oder daß er noch weitere Beispiele (mit Belegen?) angeführt hat, in denen Vögel mit ihrem Gesang Vorbilder für bestimmte Lieder gewesen sind.”

Alcman’s Invention of Erotic Poetry

27 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.75 600f-601a

Archytas the harmonist,¹ as Chamaeleon² says, claimed that Alcman was the leader of erotic songs and was the first to publish an uncensored song, being prone towards pursuits of women and that sort of muse. For he says in one of his songs, “Once again Eros, for Cypris’ sake, flows sweet over my heart and melts it.” He says too, that he fell immoderately in love with Megalostrate, who was both a poet and able to attract lovers to her by conversation. He speaks thus of her: “Golden-haired Megalostrate, happy maiden, demonstrated this gift of the sweet Muses.”³

The text (published in the drafting of the codex A, merely noting the intervention of philologists in the critical apparatus) is difficult in several places. Line 1 needs a regent verb (λέγει or φησί must be supposed); line 3 shows an uncertain punctuation between ἀκόλαστον ὄντα, and the significance of what follows is unclear; at line 8 critics wonder whether the subject of λέγει is Chamaeleon, or rather Alcman: see Schorn¹, p. 56. Wehrli², Steffen and Giordano² limited the

228 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

ἐρωτικὸς πάνυ εὐρετὴς γέγονε τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν 6-7 *Alcman fr. 59a Davies = 148 Calame* 11-13 *Alcman fr. 59b Davies = 149 Calame*

1 Ἀρχύτης *A* 1-2 ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων, Ἀλκμᾶνα γεγονέναι *codd.* : ὥς Χαμαιλέων φησι Ἀλκμᾶνα γεγονέναι *Marzullo* 1-4 Ἀλκμᾶνα – διατριβάς *codd.* : Ἀλκμᾶνί φησι γεγονέναι τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν ἡγεμόνα ἀκόλαστον ὄντα περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ ἐκδοῦναι πρῶτον τὴν τοιαύτην μοῦσαν εἰς τὰς διατριβάς *Peppink, verba turbata esse suspicans* 3 ὄντα *codd.* : ἔχοντα *Hecker*, ὄν τὰ *Edmonds*, ὄν *Calame, del. Marzullo* καὶ *del. Hecker*, καταφερῇ *Bergk* 6 Ἔρος *Bergk* με δηῦτε *Page* : με δ' αὔτε *A*, δ' αὔ με *C E*, με δαῦτε *Bergk* ἑκατι *Bergk* : ἑκατι *codd.* 8 οὐ μετρίως *Schweighäuser* : συμμέτρως *A* 8 ἐρασθείη *Cobet* 11 τοῦτο *Ἰαδειᾶν Bergk*: τουθ' αδειαν *A*, τοῦτο ἀδειᾶν *Stephanus*, τοῦτο Ἰαδηᾶν *Sitzler* ἔδειξε *Μωσᾶν Wilamowitz* : Μουσᾶν ἔδειξε *A*, Μωσᾶν ἔδειξε *Stephanus* 11-13 *om. Epitom.* 12 παρσένων *Page* : παρθένων *A*

SAPPHO

Sappho et Anacreon

Περὶ Σαπφούς

28 *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae, 13.72 599c-d (BT vol. 3 p. 320.23-321.24 Kaibel)*

26 W ἐν τούτοις ὁ Ἑρμησιάναξ σφάλλεται συγχρονεῖν οἰόμενος Σαπφῶ καὶ Ἀνακρέοντα, τὸν μὲν κατὰ Κῦρον καὶ Πολυκράτην γενόμενον, τὴν δὲ κατ' Ἀλυάπτην τὸν Κροίσου

quotation to both the fragments of Alcman, while Scorza, p. 9 n. 1, and Koepke, p. 38, considered the fragment ended before the reference to Alcman's love for Megalostrate, believing that it is an addition of Athenaeus.

¹ Chamaeleon quotes from Archytas ὁ ἁρμονικός. He may be Archytas of Tarentum, a Pythagorean philosopher known for his musical studies and author of a work entitled τὸ ἁρμονικόν (B1 D.-K.): so Marzullo, pp. 297-298, Lorenzoni, p. 148, Giordano², pp. 148-150, Steffen, p. 46-47, Wehrli², p. 79, and Schorn¹, pp. 55-56. This interpretation also seems preferable because of the agreement between Chamaeleon's musical theories and those of the Pythagorean school (see notes to 4-6). But the problem is still debated: the last editor of Archytas of Tarentum (Huffman, pp. 26-27) assigns this fragment not to the Pythagorean, but to Archytas of Mytilene *mousikòs* because the songs of Alcman belonged to his repertoire while Archytas of Tarentum does not appear to have been concerned with poetry (as well Giordano¹, pp. 131-134, then corrected in Giordano²).

² Critics have clearly shown that Chamaeleon, perhaps following Archytas (see Schorn¹, pp. 57-58, but we can not exclude the possibility that the second group of verses could be an addition of Chamaeleon), misunderstands the meaning of the verses, since the first of them do not allude to an immoderate passion for women in the poet (because the words are not pronounced by the poet himself but by a chorus), and the later verses refer to a love for Megalostrate (who was the *coryphaea* of a chorus of girls singing this song; see Schorn¹, p. 57 and n. 21). If the whole passage came to Chamaeleon from Archytas, the conclusion of Schorn¹, p. 58, seems probable, that the passage shows the 'method of Chamaeleon' already applied by a philosopher of 5th-4th century BC.

³ The application of the 'method of Chamaeleon' (see above, n. 2) and the presence of analogous information in the short entry about the poet Alcman in the *Suda* (see app. loc. parall.) support the hypothesis that the fragment comes from a biography of Alcman; but the clear misunderstanding of such an important theme in a monograph devoted to his life, which should have contemplated a more accurate knowledge of the contents of his poetry, can suggest another solution: if it is accepted that 13, the passage in which Chamaeleon misunderstands the meaning of two verses of the poet Alcaeus, cannot belong to a monograph dedicated to the poet of Mytilene, then again one must suppose that the quotation does not derive from an unattested Περὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος, but from a treatise more generally dedicated to music or lyric poetry, if not on pleasure (see Marzullo, pp. 297-98 and Lorenzoni², p. 148).

SAPPHO

Sappho and Anacreon

28 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.72 599c-d

In these lines Hermesianax is mistaken to think that Sappho and Anacreon were contemporaries since he was born in the time of Cyrus and Polycrates and she at the time of Alyattes the father

πατέρα. Χαμαιλέων δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ Σαπφοῦς καὶ λέγειν
τινάς φησιν εἰς αὐτὴν πεποιῆσθαι ὑπὸ Ἀνακρέοντος τάδε· 5
σφαίρη δηῦτέ με πορφυρέη
βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἔρως
νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλῳ
συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται.
ἢ δ', ἐστὶν γὰρ ἀπ' εὐκτίτου 10
Λέσβου, τὴν μὲν ἐμὴν κόμην,
λευκὴ γάρ, καταμέμφεται,
599d πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινὰ χάσκει.
καὶ τὴν Σαπφὼν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ταῦτά φησιν εἰπεῖν·
κείνον, ὦ χρυσόθρονε Μοῦσ', ἔνισπες 15
ῥυμνον, ἐκ τῆς καλλιγύναικος ἐσθλᾶς
Τήιος χώρας ὃν ᾄδειτε τερπνῶς
πρέσβυς ἀγαυός.
ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶ Σαπφοῦς τοῦτο τὸ ᾄσμα παντὶ που δῆλον.
ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι παίζειν τὸν Ἑρμησιάνακτα περὶ τούτου 20
τοῦ ἔρωτος. καὶ γὰρ Δίφιλος ὁ κωμωδοποιὸς πεποίηκεν
ἐν Σαπφοῖ δράματι Σαπφοῦς ἐραστὰς Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ
Ἰππώνακτα.

Sappho T 250 Voigt = T 30 Gallavotti² 1 Hermesianax fr. 7.49-56 Powell (= fr. 3 Lightfoot) 6-13 Anacreon fr. 13 Gentili 15-18 fr. adesp. 35 Page 21-23 Diphilus PCG fr. 71 K.-A.

6 δηῦτε *Seidler* : δεῦτε *codd.* πορφυρέη *Pauw* : πορφυρένι *A*, πορφυρῇ *Flick* 8 ποικιλοσαμβάλῳ *Seidler* : ποικίλος λαμβάνω *A* 10 ἀπ' εὐκτίτου *Barnes* : ἀπευκτικού *A* 13 ἄλλον *Pauw, Delecamp, Bergk⁴* 15-18 κείνον ... Μοῦσ', ἔνισπες ... Τήιος χώρας ὃν ... ἀγαυός *Barnes* : κείνων ... μοῦσα, εἰνσπες ... ὁ Τήιος χώρας ὅς ... ἀγλαός *A*

Vita Sapphonis

29 *POxy. XV 1800, s. II-III p. Chr., fr. 1, coll. 1-2, ll. 2-35 Hunt (pp. 138-139 Hunt)*

[. . . | [περὶ Σαπφ]οῦς
Σαπφὼ τὸ μὲν γένος] ἦν Λε-

of Croesus. But Chamaeleon¹ in his book *On Sappho* says that some² claim that Anacreon composed the following lines for her: “Now golden-haired Eros strikes me with a purple sphere and challenges me to play with the maiden of the textured sandal. But she, for she is from fair Lesbos, finds fault with my hair, for it is white, and gazes at another,” and that Sappho said this in response to him (Anacreon): “You invoked that hymn, O golden-throned Muse, from the noble land of beautiful women, which the glorious old man of Teos sang pleasantly.” That this song is not by Sappho is clear to all. But I think Hermesianax was playing about this love affair. For the comic poet Diphilus in his play *Sappho* also presented Archilochus and Hipponax as lovers of Sappho.

¹ The quotation from Chamaeleon’s book *on Sappho* seems limited to the passage between Χαμαιλέων and δηλον, while the few lines commenting on the quotation of Hermesianax have to be considered as Athenaeus’ framing of Chamaeleon. The way the story is presented is quite uncertain (καὶ λέγειν τινὰς φησιν), and the insertion of Athenaeus (ἐγὼ δὲ – Ἰππώνακτα), which is well defined by the position of ἐγὼ δὲ, suggests (see Scorza, p. 13, and Wehrli², pp. 79-80; contrary to this Koepke, p. 20, Bowra, pp. 324-325, and Giordano², pp. 151-153) that Chamaeleon does not believe the story of contemporaneity between Anacreon and Sappho, nor the anecdote of love between the poet from Teos and the poetess of Mytilene. Chamaeleon seems the source for the consideration that follows the quotation of the verses of Sappho, in which the verses handed down under the name of the poetess are found spurious. The passage cannot be counted among those that show the unreliability of Chamaeleon’s opinions and the falsity of his ‘method’, but his care “vorhandene Informationen zu sammeln und zu überliefern, auch wenn er selbst sie als falsch abgelehnt hat” (Schorn¹, p. 60).

² The information used by Chamaeleon evidently comes from a source he used, as the τίνες shows. This source can probably be identified as the comic poets, who wrote dramas about the poetess of Lesbos, as Athenaeus says at the end of this passage, adding his own comment (ἐγὼ δὲ – Ἰππώνακτα): see Schorn¹, p. 59. On the credibility of information given (on tragedians) by comic poets see 44.10-11.

Life of Sappho

29 Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 15 1800 fr. 1, coll. 1-2, ll. 2-35

On Sappho. Sappho was Lesbian by birth, of the city of

σβία, πόλεως δὲ Μιτ]υλήνης,
5 πατρὸς δὲ Σκαμ]άνδρου, κα-
τὰ δέ τινας Σκαμ]ανδρωνύ-
μου. ἀδελφοὺς δ' ἔσχε τρεῖς
Ἑρ]ί[γιον καὶ Λά]ριχον, πρε-
σβύ]τατον δὲ Χάρ]αξον, ὃς πλεύ-
10 σας εἰς Αἴ]γυπτον] Δωρί]χα τι-
νὶ προσ[ε]νεχθεῖ]ς κατεδα-
πάνησεν εἰς ταύτην πλεῖ-
στα· τὸν δὲ Λάριχον <νέον> ὄντα μάλ-
27 w λον ἠγάπησεν. θυγατέρα δ' ἔ-
15 σχε Κλεί]ν ὁμώνυμον τῇ ἐ-
αυτῆς μητρί. κ[α]τηγόρηται
col. 2 δ' ὑπ' ἐν[ί]ω[ν] ὥς ἄτακτος οὖ-
σα] τὸν τρόπον καὶ γυναικε-
ράσ]τρια· τὴν δὲ μορφήν
20 εὐ]καταφρόνητος δοκεῖ γε-
γον]ένα[ι καὶ] δυσειδεστάτη[ν].
τὴν μὲν γὰρ ὄψιν φαιώδης
ὕ]πηρχεν, τὸ δὲ μέγεθος
μικρὰ παντελῶς, τὸ δ' αὐτὸ
25 συ]μβέβηκε καὶ περὶ τὸν
.]ν ἐλάττω [. . .] γεγονότ>α
[desunt litterae 16] ην
[desunt lineae 24]
περιτ [desunt litterae 13 ὥσ-]
περ Χαμαιλέω]ν]
30 τιος ἐπλανήθ]η]
ἀπ' αὐτοῦ λέγει [. . . Αἰολίδι]
διαλέκτῳ κεχρ]η γέ-]
γραφεν δὲ βυβλ[ία ἐννέα μὲν]
λυρικά, ἐλεγείω]ν]
35 ἐν

Sappho T 252 Voigt = T 11 Gallavotti² de Sapphonis vita, parentibus, fratribus et filia, vide Sapphonem, T 253-264 Voigt 13-14 cf. T 203a-b Voigt

omnia rest. Hunt 11 προσ[ε]νεχθεῖ]ς Voigt : προσ[ο]μιλήτ]ης Hunt, προσ[ε]ναχθεῖ]ς Gallavotti³ 13 <νέον> add. Hunt 18-19 γυναικε[|]ράσ]τρια Voigt: γυναικε[|]ρασ]τρία Gallavotti³ 24 μικρὰ Gallavotti³, μείκτρα P 26 Ἀλκαῖο]ν

Mytilene. Her father was Scamander or, according to some, Scamandronymus. She had three brothers, Erigyius, Larichus, and the oldest, Charaxus, who sailed to Egypt, being led there by Doricha, on whom he spent a lot of money. But Sappho loved the younger brother Larichus more. She had a daughter Cleis, who had the same name as her own mother. Some have criticized her as disordered in her behavior and a woman-lover. In appearance she seems to have been quite despised and ugly. Her face was dark and her stature very short. The same happened to be true of (Alcaeus)² . . . who was less . . .

. . . just as Chamaeleon . . . was mistaken¹ . . . from him says . . . used the Aeolic dialect . . . and wrote nine books of lyric poetry and . . . of elegy³.

¹ As Montanari, *CPF* I.1* pp. 407-408, noted, the content of Chamaeleon's quotation is unrecoverable because of the loss of about 24 lines between the end of column I of the papyrus and the remains of column II, which states his name. Whoever compiled this biography noted, however, that Chamaeleon gave incorrect information: that would seem the meaning of the verb ἐπλανήθη. Montanari and Di Benedetto, referring to **28**, suggest, albeit dubiously, that the biography contained in the papyrus could refer to the fact that Chamaeleon was wrong in believing that Anacreon and Sappho lived in the same period (but see **28**, n. 1). Although one cannot safely define which was the mistake of Chamaeleon (see Di Benedetto, p. 230), it is important to note that "l'autore di *POxy*. 1800 citasse Cameleonte a proposito di Saffo per dissentirne": this information can easily be put understood as indicating some evident limits of the 'method of Chamaeleon' in composing his biographies by getting material from poet's own works.

² On the integration of the name of Alcaeus see app. crit.

³ After the nominal quotation of the Heracleot, we have no explicit indication to support the hypothesis that the use of the Aeolic dialect or the number of books of lyric and, perhaps, elegiac poetry came from Chamaeleon (see Montanari, *CPF* I.1* p. 409).

Hunt γεγονότα *Hunt* : γεγونا *P* 28-30 περὶ τ[ούτων δὲ πολλοὶ ὥσ]περ Χαμαιλέων ὁ Πόν[τιος (*fort.* Πον[τικός]) ἐπλανήθησαν *Scorza*, περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον, ὥσ]περ Χαμαιλέω[ν ὁ Περιπατη]τικ[ος] ἐπλανήθη *Di Benedetto* περιτ[ῶς] ἱστόρησαν ὥσ]περ Χαμαιλέων *Gigante* 30 ἐπλανήθη ἃ εἰκάσας *Maltomini* (*vel* συμβαλὼν *Lami*) *apud Di Benedetto*, p. 224 28-31 ὥσπερ Χαμαιλέων [φησὶν ὁ Πόν]τικ[ος] ἐπλανήθη ἃ παραλαβὼν] ἀπ' αὐτοῦ λέγει *Edmonds* 31-32 τῇ δ' Αἰολίδι] διαλέκτῳ κέχρηται *Edmonds* (Αἰολίδι] διαλέκτῳ *dub. Hunt*) 34 ἐλεγείῳ[ν *Voigt* : ἐλεγείῳ[ν *Gallavotti*²

STESICHORUS

**De usu Homeri, Hesiodi, Archilochi, Mimnermi,
Phocilidis carmina musicis notis excipiendi**

Περὶ Στησιχόρου

30 *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae* 14.12 620c (*BT* vol. 3 p. 367.18-21 Kaibel)

28 w Χαμαιλέων δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Στησιχόρου καὶ μελωδηθῆναί φησιν οὐ μόνον τὰ Ὅμηρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ Ἡσιόδου καὶ Ἀρχιλόχου, ἔτι δὲ Μιμνέρμου καὶ Φωκυλίδου.

cf. Stesich. TB1 Davies, p. 145 (= *Heracl. Pont. fr. 109 Schütrumpf* = 157 *Wehrli* = *Ps.-Plut. De Mus.* 3.1132, p. 3 *Ziegler*) οὐ λελυμένην δ' εἶναι τῶν προειρημένων τὴν τῶν ποιημάτων λέξιν καὶ μέτρον οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐμμετρον> καθάπερ <τὴν> Στησιχόρου τε καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων μελοποιῶν οἱ ποιῶντες ἔπη τούτοις μέλη περιετίθεσαν *cf. etiam Petr. Satyricon* 2.4 *nec non Quint. Inst. or.* 10.1.62 *epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem* 2 *Hesiod. T* 85 *Most* = 91 *Jacoby* 3 *Archilochus T* 32 *Tarditi* *Mimn. T* 23 *Allen* = 22 *Gentili-Prato* *Phocylid. T* 10 *Gentili-Prato*

De hymno quodam Lamprocli aut Stesichoro tribuendo

31A *POxy. XIII* 1611, s. II p. Chr., fr. 5 + 43 + 40 + 6 + ? (pp. 135, 138 Grenfell = *CPF* I.1* 5T Montanari, pp. 414-415)

..[ca. 15]

σιν[ca. 15]

155 α|δεσ[ca. 15]

α|φορο[ca. 13 κα-]

θ|απερ[φησὶν Ἐρατοσθέ-]

νης ε[ca. 13]

160 ταις Φ|ρυν[ιχο].[ca. 5]

STESICHORUS

On Putting the Poetry of Hesiod, Archilochus, Mimnermus, and Phocylides to Music

30 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.12 620c

Chamaeleon in his book *On Stesichorus* states that not only was the poetry of Homer put to melodies but also that of Hesiod and Archilochus, and even of Mimnermus and Phocylides¹.

¹ That it was common among lyric poets to set non-lyric poems to music is also attested by Heraclides of Pontus (109 Schütrumpf = 157 Wehrli). For a complete *status quaestionis*, see Ercoles, pp. 346-48. See also Gostoli, pp. 145-152, esp. 147-49, and bibliography quoted there. Nothing suggests that Chamaeleon is talking about Stesichorus explicitly, but of the citharodic praxis in general, nor that he took part in the controversy about the prevalence of music over text in 4th-century lyric praxis, as stated by Steffen, p. 49, and Giordano², p. 155.

On a Hymn attributed to Lamprocles or Stesichorus

31A Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 13 1611, frs. 5 + 43 + 40 + 6 + ?

As Eratosthenes says . . . Phrynichus . . . saying . . .

236 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

ἀφηγοῦμεν|ος τ.[ca. 6]
 Πα[λ]λά[δ]α περ|σέπ[ολιν]
 κλήζ]ω π[ολ]εμ[αδό-]
 162a κο]ν ἄγν'αν π[αῖ]δα Δι-
 29c W [ὸς μ]εγάλου δ[αμάσιπ-]
 πον· οὕτω παρα[φέρει.]
 165 διαποροῦσι γὰρ οὐ[κ ὁ-]
 λίγοι π[ε]ρὶ τ[ού]των κα-
 [θ]άπερ Χαμαιλέων πό-
 τ]ερόν ποτε Στη[σι]χόρου
 ἐστὶν ἢ Λαμπροκλέ-
 170 ο]υς, κ[αί]π[ε]ρ[ι] τοῦ Φρυνί-
 χου Λαμ]προκλεῖ μα[θη<τῇ>?
 Μίδωνος?] προσνέμον-
 τος· καὶ Ἀ]ριστοφάνης
 [δὲ παραπ]οιεῖ λέγων·
 175 Παλλάδα] π[ε]ρσέ[π]ο[λιν] δεινάν]

Stesichorus fr. 97 Page = PMG 735 Page, p. 379 159 cf. Eratosthenem XIV p. 213 Bernhardt (de antiqua comoedia) 160 Phrynichus PCG fr. 78 K.-A. 162-65 Lamprocles PMG fr. 735 Page, cf. Stesichorus fr. 274 Davies 174-176 Aristoph. Nub. 967

157-159 [κα]θάπερ [φησὶν Ἑρατοσθέ]νης *Allen apud Grenfell, probavit Körte 159-60 ἐν] ταῖς Φρυνίχου [ῶ]δαῖς? Grenfell ad loc. 162 περσέπ[ολιν] vel περσέπτολιν coll. sch. Ar. Nub. 162^a-163 π[ολ]εμ[αδό][κο]ν vel πολεμοδόκον coll. sch. Ar. Nub. 165 παρα[φέρει] Holwerda 1952, 230 adn. 1 : παρα[πληροῖ] Holwerda app. sch. coll. Ar. Nub., παρα Steffen, Wehrli, παρα[ποιεῖ]? Grenfell μα[θη<τῇ>? | Μίδωνος?] Grenfell : μα..... Steffen, Wehrli, μάλα ἀκριβῶς Körte 174 καὶ Page : ... Ἀ]ριστοφάνης Steffen δὲ Steffen : dub. Grenfell, om. Arrighetti*

31B Schol. vet. in Aristoph. Nubes 967b α-β (p. 186.6-19 Holwerda)

29a-b W 967b.α: < > οὕτως Ἑρατοσθένης. Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ ἄσματος μέμνηται ὡς Λαμπροκλέους ὄντος τοῦ Μίδωνος υἱοῦ ἢ μαθητοῦ. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως· “Παλλάδα περσέπτολιν [δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον.” Χαιμαλέων δ’ 5 ἀπορεῖ πότερον “]κλήζω πολεμοδόκον ἄγν'αν παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον” καὶ κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα ὑποτίθησι κατὰ λέξιν. <Χαμαιλέων δ’ ἀπορεῖ, πότερον Στησιχόρου ἢ Λαμπροκλέους>.

“I call upon Pallas sacker of cities, glorying in war, holy child of great Zeus, master of horses.” In this way he conveys the words. For not a few are at a loss about these words, such as Chamaeleon, whether they are by Stesichorus or Lamprocles. But Phrynichus attributes them to Lamprocles the student of Midon, and Aristophanes modifies them, saying “Pallas dread sacker of cities.”¹

¹ See below, **31B** n. 1.

31B Scholium on Aristophanes’ *Clouds* 967b α-β

967b.α: In this way Eratosthenes. But Phrynichus recalls this same song as that of Lamprocles, the son or student of Midon. It goes like this: “Pallas sacker of cities, [dread goddess, rouser of the din of war.” But Chamaeleon is at a loss whether “[I call on the holy child of great Zeus, glorying in war, master of horses” and conforms word for word with Lamprocles.¹ Chamaeleon is at a loss whether it is Stesichorus’ or Lamprocles’.

967b.β: ἡ Πάλλαδα· ἀρχὴ ἄσματος Φρυνίχου, ὡς
 Ἐρατοσθένης φησίν. Φρύνιχος δὲ αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῦ 10
 ἄσματος μνημονεύει ὡς Λαμπροκλέους ὄντος “Πάλλαδα
 περσέπτολιν κληίζω πολεμαδόκον ἀγνάν, παῖδα Διὸς
 μεγάλου”.

cf. schol. vet. in Aristoph. Nubes 967c schol. Thom.-Tricl. in Aristoph. Nubes 967a Koster schol. an. recent. in Aristoph. Nubes 967a-c Koster schol. Tzetzae in Aristoph. Nub. 966a et 967a Koster schol. in Aristid. 46.162.8, vol. 3, p. 538 Dindorf Io. Tzetzes Hist. 1.685-686, p. 31 Leone 1 Phrynichus PCG fr. 78 K.-A., Holwerda Phrynicho cuidam grammatico hunc locum tribuit, cum scholiasta de Eratosthene et Chamaeleonte loquatur, sed vide Sgobbi, p. 288 et adn. 19 6 Lamprocles PMG fr. 735 Page 11 cf. Stesichorum fr. 274 Davies

967b.α 1 *ante* οὕτως *coll. sch. 967b.β, 10-11 lacunam statuit Holwerda, ita fortasse explendam ἀρχὴ ἄσματος Φρυνίχου οὕτως (Ald.) :* οὗτος *E* Φρύνιχος δὲ *Holwerda coll. sch. 967b.β :* Φρύνιχος *Dübner*, φρυνίχου *E* 3 ἔχει δὲ οὕτως *del. Sgobbi, pp. 295 et 296* 4 δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον *praeunte Sgobbi delevi, quoniam verba haec, ad exemplum Aristophanis Nub. (v. 967: δεινὰν) et Hesiodi Theog. (vv. 924-25: ἐγρεκύδοιμον) – θεὸν metri causa addito – sicut glossa ad Lamproclis versum inter lineas posita, a scriba quodam in textum inserta videntur (cf. Sgobbi, pp. 290-91)* Χαμαιλέων *Holwerda :* χαμολέων *codd. 4-5 Χαμαιλέων- πότερον cf. infra app. ad ll. 7-8 5 post πότερον lacunam statuit Holwerda, quam ita expleri posse putat* <κατὰ Στησίχορον παραπληροῖ> κληίζω *E :* κληίζω *Np* 6 μεγάλου *E : om. Np καὶ E : ἡ Holwerda post Λαμπροκλέα lacunam latere suspicatus est Holwerda 7-8 hic a ll. 4-5 Χαμαιλέων δ’ ἀπορεῖ, πότερον una cum Sgobbi, pp. 294-95, transposui coll. POxy. 1611.166-71 (cf. 32) et Στησιχόρου ἢ Λαμπροκλέους supplevi* (ταῦτά ἐστιν *post Λαμπροκλέους add. Sgobbi, p. 294)* **967b.β:** 9 φρυνίχου *R :* Στησιχόρου *van Leeuwen, φῆ V 10 φησίν om. V 12 πολεμοδόκον V*

De Stesichori palinodiis

32 POxy. XXIX 2506, s. II p. Chr., fr. 26 col. I, 2-26 (p. 10 Page)

των μ[ca. 17]
 γενομενη[...][ca. 8 μέμ-]
 φεται τὸν Ὅμηρο[ν ὅτι τὴν Ἑ-
 λένην ἐποίησεν ἐν Τ[ροίαι]
 καὶ οὐ τὸ εἶδωλον αὐτῆ[ς, ἐν]

967b.β: or Pallas: beginning of the song of Stesichorus, as Eratosthenes says; but Phrynichus recalls this same song as that of Lamprocles, “Pallas sacker of cities, I call on the holy child of great Zeus, glorying in war.”

¹ According to the text of Holwerda’s edition, Chamaeleon is uncertain about the authorship of the hymn (Stesichorus or Lamprocles?) and probably quoted two different incipits (one of Stesichorus, the second of Lamprocles), as might be inferred from comparison between scholia 967b.a and 967b.b. Arrighetti³, p. 217, (see also Arrighetti¹, pp. 85-89 and Arrighetti³, pp. 215-218) had a different opinion, that, by not determining the final two gaps, with the section Χαμαιλέων δ’ ἀπορεῖ as an afterthought, perhaps even marginal, to the problem of authorship (Eratosthenes was for Stesichorus, Phrynichus for Lamprocles), πότερον appears to be an insert to indicate the alternative version of the hymn, and the section καὶ κατὰ Λαμπροκλέα ὑποτίθησι λέξιν is to be referred to Phrynichus, who quoted the hymn “word for word” from Lamprocles. As a result, Chamaeleon would not have discussed two possible redactions of the hymn, but only the doubtful authorship of a single one. Recently Sgobbi reviewed this scholium and, relying on Arrighetti’s opinion and comparing the Aristophanes scholium 967b.a with the redaction of the scholium 967b.β and *POxy.* 1611 and other testimonies of this hymn (see Sgobbi, pp. 285-87), he states that the words ἔχει δὲ οὕτως· Πάλλαδα περσέπτολιν δεινὰν θεὸν ἐγρεκύδοιμον were an addition, perhaps interlinear, to the real incipit of the hymn (Πάλλαδα περσέπτολιν κλήζω πολεμοδόκον ἀγνάν, παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου δαμάσιππον), on the basis of Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 967 (δεινάν), and Hesiod, *Theogony* 924-25 (ἐγρεκύδοιμον). (The word θεόν could be interpreted as an addition made just to complete the metre). The phrase Χαμαιλέων δ’ ἀπορεῖ πότερον was also an insertion coming from another note, similar to *POxy.* 1611, to be integrated with Στησιχόρου ἢ Λαμπροκλέους ταῦτά ἐστιν. This view seems closer to the truth: Chamaeleon’s doubt, as testified by *POxy.* 1661, was only about the authorship of the hymn and not about two different redactions and authors, and the difficult state of the text comes from the model of the *codex Estensis* of Aristophanes.

On the Palinodes of Stesichorus

32 Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 29 2506 fr. 26 col. 1.2-26

. . . he criticizes Homer because he portrayed Helen in Troy and not her phantom, and in the other he criticizes Hesiod,¹ for

- 5 τε τ[ῆι] ἑτέραι τὸν Ἡσίοδ[ον]
 μέμ[φετ]αι· διτταὶ γάρ εἰσι πα-
 λινωιδ[ί<αι>] δι[α]λλάττουσαι, καὶ ἔ-
 στιν <τ>ῆ<ς> μὲν <ῆ> ἀρχή· “Δεῦρ’ αὖ-
 τε θεὰ φιλόμολπε,” τῆς δέ·
 10 “Χρυσόπτερε παρθένε,” ὥς
 ἀνέγραψε Χαμαιλέων. αὖ-
 τὸς δέ φησιν ὁ Στησίχορος
 τὸ μὲν εἰδωλοῖν ἐλθεῖν ἐς
 Τροίαν, τὴν δ’ Ἑλένην π[αρά]
 15 τῷ Πρωτεῖ καταμεῖν[αι· οὐ-]
 τως δὲ ἐκ[α]ινοποίησε τ[ὰς]
 ἱστορ[ί]ας ὥστε Δημοφῶντ[α]
 μὲν τὸν Θησέως ἐν τ[ῷ] νό-
 [στωι] με[τὰ] τῶν θε[. . .]δων
 20 ἀνενεχ[θῆναι] λέγειν [ἐ]ς [Αἴ-]
 γυπτον, [γενέσθαι] δὲ Θη[σεῖ]
 Δημοφῶντα μὲν ἐξ Ἰό[πης]
 τῆς Ἰφικλέους, Ἀ[κάμαν]τα δὲ]
 ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἀμ[. . . .]..τη
 25 [. . .]λη.

Stesichorus PMG 193 Page Loci de Palinodiis pluribus : Con. Narrat. FGGrHist 26 F 1,18 κακεῖθεν ἐξιόντα ἀπαγγέλλειν Στησιχόρῳ Ἑλένη κελεύει τὴν εἰς αὐτὴν ἄδειν εἰ φιλεῖ τὰς ὄψεις, παλινωδίαν. Στησίχορος δὲ αὐτίκα ὕμνους Ἑλένης συντάττει καὶ τὴν ὄψιν ἀνακομίζεται *Iren. Adv. haereses 1.16,2 Harvey (vol. I p. 192)* fuisse autem eam et in illa Helena, propter quam Troianum contractum est bellum; quapropter et Stesichorum per carmina maledicentem eam, orbatum oculis: post deinde poenitentem et scribentem eas, quae vocantur palinodias, in quibus hymnizavit eam, rursus vidisse *Hyppolit. Elenchos 6.19,3 Wendland* οὕτως γοῦν τὸν Στησίχορον διὰ τῶν ἐπῶν λοιδορήσαντα αὐτὴν (*scil.* Ἑλένην), τὰς ὄψεις τυφλωθῆναι· αὐτὸς δέ, μεταμεληθέντος αὐτοῦ καὶ γράψαντος τὰς παλινωδίας ἐν αἷς ὕμνησεν αὐτὴν, ἀναβλέψαι

Loci de Palinodia una: Plat. Phaedr. 243b ἔστιν δὲ ἀμαρτάνουσι περὶ μυθολογίαν καθαρμὸς ἀρχαῖος, ὃν Ὅμηρος μὲν οὐκ ἤσθετο, Στησίχορος δέ. τῶν γὰρ ὁμμάτων στερηθεὶς διὰ τὴν Ἑλένης κακηγορίαν, οὐκ ἠγνόησεν ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος, ἀλλ’ ἅτε μουσικὸς ὢν ἔγνω τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ποιεῖ εὐθύς· “οὐκ ἔστ’ — Τροίας”, καὶ ποιήσας δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωδίαν παραχρῆμα ἀνέβλεψεν *Isocrat. Hel. Enc. 64 (3-*

two are the palinodes² and they differ from each other: of the one the beginning is “Here again goddess, lover of song”; of the other “Golden-winged maiden,” as Chamaeleon recorded.³

Stesichorus himself says that the phantom went to Troy and Helen stayed with Proteus. Indeed he changed stories in the following way: he says that Demophon the son of Theseus was brought to Egypt with [] on the return voyage and that Demophon was born to Theseus from Iolpe the daughter of Iphicles, and Acamas . . .

¹ The papyrus fragment from Oxyrhynchus reports the notice, ascribed to Chamaeleon, that Stesichorus wrote not one but two palinodes to his *Helena*. The first was made to confute Homer, who portrayed the real Helen and not her phantom in Troy, the second against Hesiod, but the author of the commentary does not indicate the reason of this confutation. One can compare Hesiod, fr. 358 M.-W. = fr. 298 Most (see app. loc. par.), in which we find that Hesiod was the first to introduce the phantom in connection with Helen (but the source is a late one, the *Paraphrasis* on Lycophron’s *Alexandra*), or, more probably, with Hesiod, fr. 247 Most = 176 M.-W., in which Hesiod explicitly says that Helen ἥσχυνε λέχος ξανθοῦ Μενελάου.

² Of both palinodes the Peripatetic wrote down the opening words, which are configured in both cases as an invocation to the Muse in the metrical structure of enoplium. Since the edition of the fragment, critics have split into two positions: Cingano, Gentili and Giordano² accept Chamaeleon’s opinion, on the basis of the parallel with Canon and Irenaeus (see app. loc. parall.) and support the existence of two palinodes; Woodbury, Leone, Kannicht, Gerber, and Arrighetti reject it, and think that Chamaeleon misunderstood a second invocation of the Muse within the same poem and made of it the opening words of the second (see Montanari *CPF** 1, pp. 412-413). Arrighetti², pp. 108-109, n. 24, pointed out especially that distinction between the two poems before Aristophanes of Byzantium’s division into *cola* had to be very difficult and that a reader could find it by paying special attention to the invocation of the Muse, which was usually at the beginning of a poem. This may have misled Chamaeleon, who, reading two invocations, supposed two palinodes. A. Kelly recently proposed a new reading of this matter, supposing that the poem of Stesichorus was only one, divided in three separated segments: in the first the poet, after the invocation χρυσόπτερε παρθένε, told the story of Helen’s marriage and betrayal; then, after narrating an episode in which Helen, probably in a dream, appeared to him and awoke him blind, he recanted using the famous verses handed down by Plato and the invocation δεῦρ’ αὖτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε of the papyrus; probably afterwards he told the story of Helen in Egypt and of the εἶδωλον in Troy. But this reading does not keep Plato’s testimony in the right proportion (see app. loc. parall.). It talks clearly about two different texts, the one with the κακηγορία of Helen, the second ‘called’ παλινωδία, in an evident parallel with the two different speeches of Socrates, the first of which is a κακηγορία of Eros and the second a correspondent παλινωδία. But

5) *Mathieu* ἐπειδὴ δὲ γνοὺς τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς συμφορᾶς τὴν καλουμένην Παλινωδίαν ἐποίησε, πάλιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν κατέστησε. *Dio. Chrys. or. 11.40* καὶ τὸν μὲν Στησίχορον ἐν τῇ ὕστερον ᾠδῇ λέγειν ὅτι τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲ πλεύσειεν ἡ Ἑλένη οὐδαμόσε *schol. in Aristid. Orat. 1.212* Στησίχορος ἐν τῇ ποιήσει λεγείν ὡς ἥρπακώς τὴν Ἑλένην Ἀλέξανδρος ... *Philostr. Vita Apoll. 6.11* σοφία Ἱμεραίου ἀνδρός, ὃς ἄδων ἐς τὴν Ἑλένην ἐναντίον τῷ προτέρῳ λόγῳ παλινωδίαν αὐτὸν ἐκάλεσεν. [*Acro*] *in Hor. Carm. 1.16 pp. 71-72 Keller* ... imitatus Ste[r]sic<h>orum poetam Siculum, qui vituperationem Helenae scribens caecatus est et postea responso Apollinis laudem eius scripsit et oculorum aspectus recepit ... *Sud. lex. Σ 1095.25-26 Adler s.v.* Στησίχορος ... φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν γράψαντα ψόγον Ἑλένης τυφλωθῆναι, πάλιν δὲ γράψαντα Ἑλένης ἐγκώμιον ἐξ ὀνείρου τὴν παλινωδίαν ἀναβλέψαι.

4-6 cf. *Paraphr. antiq. ad Lycophr. Alex. 822, p. 330 Leone* πρῶτος Ἡσίοδος (*fr. 358 M.-W.*) περὶ τῆς Ἑλένης τὸ εἶδωλον παρήγαγε. καὶ Ἡρόδοτος δὲ εἶπεν, ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἀληθινὴ Ἑλένη ἔμεινεν παρὰ τῷ Πρωτεῖ, τὸ δὲ εἶδωλον αὐτῆς συνέπλευσεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐπὶ τὴν Τροίαν. εἰς εὐδίαν, εἰς αἰθρίαν φυγόν, *nec non schol. vet. ad Lycophr. Alex. 822, p. 164 Leone et schol. in Eur. Or. 249 (= Hesiod. fr. 176 M.-W.)* ὡς δ' Ἑλένη ἦσχυνε λέχος ξανθοῦ Μενελάου.

omnia suppl. Lobel apud Page 6-7 παλινωιδί[αι] δι[α]λλάττουσαι *Montanari* : παλινωιδίαι διαλλάττουσαι *Page* <τ>ῆς< >μὲν <ῆ> ἀρχή *suppl. Fraenkel apud Mette*

LASUS HERMIONEUS

Lasi ioci duo

περὶ Λάσου

33 *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 8.20 338b-d (BT vol. 2 p. 243.5-20 Kaibel)*

30 W οἶδα δὲ καὶ ἃ ὁ Ἑρμιονεύς Λᾶσος ἔπαιξε περὶ ἰχθύων, ἅπερ Χαμαιλέων ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λάσου συγγράμματι λέγων ὧδε· “τὸν Λᾶσὸν φησι τὸν ὠμὸν ἰχθὺν ὁπτόν εἶναι φάσκειν. θαυμαζόντων δὲ πολλῶν ἐπιχειρεῖν λέγοντα ὡς ὃ ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι τοῦτό 5
338c ἔστιν ἀκουστὸν καὶ ὃ ἔστιν νοῆσαι τοῦτό ἔστιν νοητόν· ὡσαύτως οὖν καὶ ὃ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τοῦτ' εἶναι ὁπτόν· ὥστ' ἐπειδὴ τὸν ἰχθὺν ἦν ἰδεῖν, ὁπτόν αὐτὸν εἶναι. καὶ παίζων δέ ποτε ἰχθὺν παρὰ τινων ἀλιέων ὑφείλετο καὶ λαβὼν

the point is, in my opinion, that Chamaeleon, quoting two opening lines and specifying the intent of the supposed two palinodes, first read in a critical way the problem of this composition. Assuming also that his opinion is false, this information shows on the one hand the fidelity of the philosopher-critic to Aristotelian methods of literary investigation (see Giordano², pp. 160 and 162), on the other the advances that somehow associate him with the new methods that will become Alexandrian philology.

LASUS OF HERMIONE

Two Jokes of Lasus

33 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 8.20 338b-d

I know also what Lasus of Hermione¹ joked about fish, which Chamaeleon of Heraclea recorded in his book *On Lasus* himself. He says that Lasus declares raw fish to be *optos* (roasted). When many were surprised, he tried saying that what can be heard (*estin akousai*) is hearable (*akoustos*) and what can be thought (*estin noêsai*) is thinkable (*noêtos*). In the same way, then, also what can be seen (*estin idein*) is visible (*optos*),² so that whenever it is possible to see the fish, it is *optos*. And once for fun he snatched a fish from some fishermen and after taking it gave it to one of the

338d ἔδωκέ τινι τῶν παρεστώτων. ὀρκίζοντος δὲ τοῦ ἀλιέως 10
ὥμοσεν μήτ' αὐτὸς ἔχειν τὸν ἰχθὺν μήτ' ἄλλῳ συνειδέναι
λαβόντι, διὰ τὸ λαβεῖν μὲν αὐτόν, ἔχειν δὲ ἕτερον, ὃν
ἐδίδαξεν ἀπομόσαι πάλιν ὅτι οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἔλαβεν οὐτ' ἄλλον
ἔχοντα οἶδεν· εἰλήφει μὲν γὰρ ὁ Λᾶσος, εἶχεν δὲ αὐτός”.

Lasus T 9 Brussich

3 τοῦ Λάσου *secl. Nauck* 4 φασι *Koepke* 5 λέγοντα *Kaibel* : λέγειν *A*,
λέγων *C* 5-6 ἀκοῦσαι τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀκουστὸν *C* : ἀκοῦσαι τοῦτό ἐστιν
ἀκοῦσαι τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀκουστὸν *A* 9 τινων *A* : τινος τῶν *Diels* 10 τοῦ
ἀλιέως *om. A*

bystanders. When the fisherman put him on oath, he swore that he neither had the fish himself nor did he know of another who had taken it, because he took it himself but another had it, whom he had instructed to disavow again that he had taken it himself or that he knew another who had it. For Lasus had taken it but he himself had it.³

¹ The interest of Peripatetics in Lasus of Hermione is well demonstrated by the works of Heraclides of Pontus, who mentions him in the book *Περὶ μουσικῆς* (113-114 Schütrumpf = 161 and 163 Wehrli) Aristoxenus of Tarentum (Lasus T 12 Brussich = *Elementa harmonica* 1.3 p. 7 Da Rios and fr. 117 Wehrli, perhaps from the *Βίος Πυθαγόρου* or a *Περὶ διθυραμβοποιῶν*), Hermippus of Smyrna, who mentioned him in the work *On Legislators* and *On the Seven Wise Men* (F4 Brussich = *FGrHist* cont. 1026 F 3 Bollansée; T6 Brussich = *FGrHist* cont. 1026 F 10 Bollansée) Clearchus (fr. 88 Wehrli) and indeed by the only known monograph on dithyramb writer, the *Περὶ Λάσου* of Chamaeleon. In Lasus there flowed more than one interest that is elsewhere demonstrated by Chamaeleon: he was in fact enumerated in some lists of the Seven Wise Men (T1 and T6 Brussich, maybe by Chamaeleon first: see Privitera, pp. 55-57), an issue not unrelated to Chamaeleon (see **3A-C**); he was an innovator, or was described as such, in music (see T10, T10A, T10b, T11, T11a, T15 Brussich; see also Ieranò 1997, pp. 197-200, esp. 200: “il legame diretto tra le riforme di Laso e gli esperimenti del ditirambo ‘nuovo’ fu in realtà una schematizzazione critica maturata nell’età ellenistica, sulla base degli studi di Aristosseno e Cameleonte”); he was considered teacher of Pindar (see T5, T5A and T5b Brussich: this information comes from the life of the famous lyric poet composed by Eustathius, in a passage adjacent to **35C** of this edition). Based on these arguments, and through further clues, Bollansée (Bollansée, ed., pp. 171-174 and references cited therein) demonstrated the influence that Chamaeleon’s work *On Lasus* had exercised over Hermippus and the studies that converged in the homonymous lemma of *Suda lex.*, λ 139 Adler.

² The words for “visible” and “roasted” have the same sound and spelling (*optos*). This joke of Lasus has been connected with the well known *lasismata*, a kind of sentence typical of Lasus’ *sophia*, which situate Lasus between ancient *sophoi* and current *sophistai*. In this case, the *amphibolia* between the two meanings of a word with the same sound and spelling shows that Lasus was not making a joke, but that he was taking a position, from Chamaeleon’s point of view, against homonymy with respect to a developing theory about ἀκριβεία τῶν ὀνομάτων and ὀρθοέπεια begun during the 5th century by Protagoras: see Privitera pp. 53-55.

³ In this case Lasus, in Chamaeleon’s point of view, was taking a position against synonymy: the verbs ἔχειν and λαβεῖν were used as synonyms and are used by Lasus to show how improper this use was.

PINDARUS

Pindarus ad carmina condenda inducitur

34A *POxy.* XXVI 2451B, s. I-II p. Chr., fr. 1 (p. 162 Lobel = *CPF* I.1* 2T, pp. 404-6 Montanari)

] Χαμαιλέω[ν
3 περὶ τὸν Ἑλι]κῶνα κυν[ηγετ
 πε]τομενα[

De hac fabula aliter narrata cf. Paus. Graec. descr. 9.23.2 Πίνδαρον δὲ ἡλικίαν ὄντα νεανίσκον καὶ ἰόντα ἐς Θεσπιάς ὥρα καύματος περὶ μεσοῦσαν μάλιστα ἡμέραν κόπος καὶ ὕπνος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κατελάμβανεν· ὁ μὲν δὴ ὥς εἶχε κατακλίνεται βραχὺ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁδοῦ, μέλισσαι δὲ αὐτῷ καθεύδοντι προσεπέτοντό τε καὶ ἔπλασσον πρὸς τὰ χεῖλη τοῦ κηροῦ. ἀρχὴ μὲν Πινδάρῳ ποιεῖν ᾠσματα ἐγένετο τοιαύτη *Aelian. Var. Hist. 12.45 Dio. Chrys. or. 64. 23 Philostr. Imag. 2.12 Lact. Div. inst. 1.22.19*

2]Χαμαιλέω[ν καὶ Ἰστρος ἱστοροῦσι *Gallo*,]Χαμαιλέω[ν καὶ Ἰστρος φασὶ *Mette*,]Χαμαιλέω[ν δὲ κτλ. *malit Montanari* κυν[ηγετ *Montanari* : κυν[ηγετοῦντος αὐτοῦ *Gallo*, κυν[ηγετοῦντα αὐτόν *Mette* 4 πε]τομενα[*Montanari* : προσπε]τομενα[ς (τὰς) μελίσσας *Gallo*

34B *Vita Pindari Ambrosiana* (vol. 1 p. 1.6-11 Drachmann)

32a W παῖς δὲ ὢν ὁ Πίνδαρος, ὥς Χαμαιλέων καὶ Ἰστρος φασί, περὶ τὸν Ἑλικῶνα θηρῶντα αὐτὸν ὑπὸ πολλοῦ καμάτου εἰς ὕπνον κατενεχθῆναι, κοιμωμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ μέλισσαν τῷ στόματι προσκαθίσασαν κηρία ποιῆσαι. οἱ δὲ φασιν ὅτι ὄναρ εἶδεν ὥς μέλιτος καὶ κηροῦ πλήρες εἶναι αὐτοῦ τὸ 5 στόμα, καὶ ἐπὶ ποιητικὴν ἐτράπη.

1 *Ister FGrHist 334 F77*

5 εἶναι A : γεγόνοι *Eust. Prooem. comm. Pind. 27.12-13 (34C)*, εἴη *coni. Westermann*

PINDAR

Pindar Is Induced to Write Poetry

34A Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 26 2451B, fr. 1

.... Chamaeleon ... | ... around Helicon hunt[... | ...
flying [... ¹

This fragment, from *POxy.* 2541B, comes from a roll containing a commentary on Pindar's *Isthmian*, preceded by a biography of the poet. So Lobel, p. 155, assumed in the *editio princeps* of the papyrus, an opinion later supported also by Gallo², p. 243, who thought it a “bios grammaticale”, composed not later than the first century AD. The source of **35A-B-C** seems to be the same, a biographical treatise on the poet that traces back to Chamaeleon's *Περὶ Πινδάρου*. On this fragment see Schorn², in this volume.

¹ The few elements that can be derived from the papyrus evidently refer to the tale of foreboding that led Pindar to poetry, as in **34B-C**, which, taken from two βίοι of the poet, mention the episode (the bee that puts honeycombs in Pindar's mouth, making of him a poet) in accordance with the version of Ister (see above, **34B** n. 1) and Chamaeleon (mentioned from the first, see Scorza, p. 25). This anecdote seems to confirm the offhand ‘method of Chamaeleon’: see Pindar, fr. 152 Mähler: μελισσοτεύκτων κηρίων ἐμὰ γλυκερώτερος ὁμφά.

34B *Ambrosian Life of Pindar*, p. 1.6-11 Drachmann

Chamaeleon and Ister¹ say that as a child Pindar, when hunting around Helicon was overwhelmed by great tiredness and went to sleep, and while he slept a bee settled in his mouth to make honeycombs. And they say that he saw a dream in which his mouth was full of honey and wax, and so he turned to poetry.²

¹ Ister, from the first half of 3rd century BC, a pupil of Callimachus and grammarian himself, had been author of many antiquarian works (*Ἀπτικά*, *Ἀποικίαι Αἰγυπτίων* and others) and critical essays on poets and grammar (an exegetical work on Homer, the *Ἀπτικάι λέξεις* and a book on the *μελοποιοί*); see Jackson, pp. 7-16. This fragment may come from his work on lyric poets, in which he may have quoted Chamaeleon.

² **34B-C** juxtapose another version of the episode (Pindar sleeping had a dream in which his mouth appeared to him full of honey) and Scorza thought that this variant of the tale had to be ascribed to Chamaeleon. Both anecdotes probably date back to Chamaeleon's *Περὶ Πινδάρου* (see Scorza, p. 25).

34C Eustathius *Prooemium commentariorum Pindaricorum* 27.12-13 (p. 24.14-19 Kambylis)

32b W Χαμαιλέων δέ, φασι, καὶ Ἴστρος ἱστοροῦσιν, ὥς περὶ Ἑλικῶνα θηρῶντος αὐτοῦ (*scil.* Πινδάρου) καὶ καμάτῳ κατενεχθέντος εἰς ὕπνον μέλισσα τῷ στόματι προσκαθίσασα κηρία ἐνέθετο· οἱ δὲ ὄναρ φασὶν ἰδεῖν αὐτόν, ὥς μέλιτος καὶ κηροῦ πλήρες αὐτῷ γεγόνοι τὸ στόμα. καὶ οὕτως 5 οἰωνισάμενος ἔπειτα εἰς ποιητικὴν ἐτράπη, ...

1 *locum hunc nec in Istro FGrHist 334, nec in commentario ad Istri fragmentum 77 pertinentem, ubi Aeliani Var. Hist. 12.45 et Pausaniae Graec. descr. 9.23.2 mentio fit, inveni*

1 δέ φασι *B et edd. ante Abel (cf. Kambylis praef. ad ed. p. 133)*

De meretricibus Corinthi Venerem publice precantibus

Περὶ Πινδάρου

35 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.32-33 573c-574b (*BT* vol. 3 pp. 264.4-266.6 Kaibel)

31 W νόμιμόν ἐστιν ἀρχαῖον ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ὥς καὶ Χαμαιλέων ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῷ περὶ Πινδάρου, ὅταν ἡ πόλις εὐχεται περὶ μεγάλων τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ, συμπαραλαμβάνεσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἱκετείαν τὰς ἐταῖρας ὥς πλείστας, καὶ ταύτας προσεύχεσθαι τῇ θεῷ καὶ ὕστερον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς παρεῖναι. 5 καὶ ὅτε δὴ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὴν στρατείαν ἦγεν ὁ Πέρσης, ὥς καὶ Θεόπομπος ἱστορεῖ καὶ Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ, αἱ Κορίνθιαι ἐταῖραι εὐξάντο ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας εἰς τὸν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἐλθοῦσαι νεών. διὸ καὶ Σιμωνίδης ἀναθέντων τῶν Κορινθίων πίνακα τῇ θεῷ τὸν 10 ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμένοντα καὶ τὰς ἐταῖρας ἰδίᾳ γραψάντων τὰς τότε ποιησαμένας τὴν ἱκετείαν καὶ ὕστερον παρούσας συνέθηκε τόδε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα·

αἶδ' ὑπὲρ Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ εὐθυμάχων πολιητῶν
ἔσταθεν εὐχεσθαι Κύπριδι δαιμονία· 15

573e οὐ γὰρ τοξοφόροις ἐμήσατο δι' Ἀφροδίτα
Πέρσαις Ἑλλάνων ἀκρόπολιν προδόμεν.
καὶ οἱ ἰδιῶται δὲ κατεύχονται τῇ θεῷ τελεσθέντων
περὶ ὧν ἂν ποιῶνται τὴν δέησιν ἀπάξειν αὐτῇ καὶ τὰς

34C Eustathius, *Introduction to the Commentary on Pindar* 27.12-13

Chamaeleon, they say, and Ister report that while he was hunting around Helicon and was overwhelmed by tiredness and went to sleep, a bee, having settled in his mouth, put honeycombs in it. They say that he saw a dream in which his mouth became full of honey and wax. And because of the dreaming he became a poet.¹

¹ Note that in Eustathius, very close to this anecdote (27.13 p. 24 ll. 19-20), there is a story about the *musical institutio* that Pindar received from Lasus: ultimately, the source of this information may also be Chamaeleon (see commentary to **33** and Privitera, p. 61).

On Prostitutes Who Pray to Aphrodite in Corinth

35 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.32-33 573c-574b

It is an old custom at Corinth, as Chamaeleon the Heracleot reports in his book *On Pindar*, that whenever the city prays to Aphrodite about important matters they include as many prostitutes¹ as possible in their supplication, and the prostitutes pray to the goddess and later are present at the sacrifices. When indeed the Persian waged the campaign on Greece, as Theopompus reports and Timaeus,² in his seventh book, the Corinthian prostitutes prayed for the safety of the Greeks by going into the temple of Aphrodite. Therefore, when the Corinthians set up a plaque to the goddess, which remains there even now,³ and wrote down individually the names of the prostitutes who did the supplication then and were later present, Simonides composed this epigram: “These women stood in prayer to heavenly Cypris on behalf of the Greeks and their fair-fighting citizens, for divine Aphrodite did not want to betray the acropolis of the Greeks to the arrow-bearing Persians.” Private citizens also pray to the goddess that if what they make their request about

ἑταίρας. ὑπάρχοντος οὖν τοῦ τοιούτου νομίμου περὶ τὴν 20
θεόν, Ξενοφῶν ὁ Κορίνθιος ἐξιὼν εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἐπὶ τὸν
ἀγῶνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπάξειν ἑταίρας εὗξατο τῇ θεῷ νικήσας.
573f Πίνδαρός τε τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔγραψεν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐγκώμιον,
οὗ ἡ ἀρχή·

Τρισολυμπιονίκαν 25
ἐπαινέων οἶκον,

ὑστερον δὲ καὶ σκόλιον τὸ παρὰ τὴν θυσίαν ἀσθέν, ἐν
ᾧ τὴν ἀρχὴν εὐθέως πεποιήται πρὸς τὰς ἑταίρας, αἱ
παραγενομένου τοῦ Ξενοφώντος καὶ θύοντος τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ
συνέθυσαν. διόπερ ἔφη· 30

ὦ Κύπρου δέσποινα, τεὸν δεῦτ' ἐς ἄλσος
φορβάδων κορᾶν ἀγέλαν ἑκατόγγυ-
574a ον Ξενοφῶν τελέαις
ἐπήγαγ' εὐχολαῖς ἱανθείς.

ἦρξατο δ' οὕτως τοῦ μέλους· 35

Πολύξεναι νεάνιδες ἀμφίπολοι
Πειθοῦς ἐν ἀφνειῷ Κορίνθῳ,
αἱ τε τὰς χλωρᾶς λιβάνου ξανθὰ δάκρη
θυμιᾶτε, πολλάκι ματέρ' ἐρώτων
οὐράνιαι πτάμεναι 40

νόηματι πρὸς Ἀφροδίταν,
ὑμῖν ἄνευθ' ἐπαγορίας ἔπορεν,
ὦ παῖδες, ἐρατειναῖς <ἐν> εὐναῖς
μαλθακᾶς ὥρας ἀπὸ καρπὸν δρέπεσθαι.
σὺν δ' ἀνάγκῃ πᾶν καλόν. 45

ἀρξάμενος δ' οὕτως ἐξῆς φησιν·
574b ἀλλὰ θαυμάζω, τί με λεξόντι Ἰσθμοῦ
δεσπότηι τοιάνδε μελίφρονος ἀρχὰν
εὐρόμενον σκολίου,
ξυνάορον ξυναῖς γυναιξίν. 50

δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς τὰς ἑταίρας διαλεγόμενος ἡγωνία
ποιόν τι φανήσεται τοῖς Κορινθίοις τὸ πρᾶγμα. πιστεύων
δέ, ὥς ἔοικεν, αὐτὸς αὐτῷ πεποίηκεν εὐθέως·

διδάξαμεν χρυσὸν καθαρᾷ βασάνῳ.

1-17 cf. *Plut. Herod. malign.* 39.871a-b nec non *schol. in Pind. Ol.* 13.32b, vol. 1, pp. 364-365 Drachmann 7 *Theopompus FGrHist* 115 F285a *Timaeus FGrHist* 566 F10 14-17 *Simonid. Ep. FGE* 14 Page 25-26 *Pind. Ol.* 13.1-

is accomplished they will bring prostitutes to her. Since this was the sort of custom there was concerning the goddess, Xenophon of Corinth,⁴ when he went to Olympia to the contest prayed that he would also bring prostitutes to the goddess if he won. And Pindar at first wrote an encomium for him, the beginning of which was, “I praise a house thrice victorious at Olympia.” Later he wrote a song (*skolion*)⁵ for a sacrifice, in which he composed a beginning for the prostitutes who joined the sacrifice when Xenophon was on hand and sacrificing to Aphrodite. Therefore he said, “O mistress of Cyprus, here to your precinct Xenophon has brought a troupe of one hundred grazing girls in joy at his fulfilled wishes.” But he began the song in this way: “Hospitable young women, attendants of Persuasion in rich Corinth who burn the blond tears of fresh frankincense, often flying heavenward in thought to the mother of Loves Aphrodite. To you, children, without reproach she provided to pluck the fruit of soft youth in loving beds. Compelled by necessity, everything is noble.” Having begun in this way, he continues, “But I wonder. What will the lords of the Isthmus say about me when I’ve composed such a beginning of sweetly minded verse, linking myself with women shared in common?” For it is clear that in directing his speech to the prostitutes he is expressing concern about what sort of action it will appear to be to the Corinthians. But with confidence in himself, it seems, he thereafter wrote, “We reveal gold by a pure touchstone.”

In a long passage devoted to prostitutes and derived from several sources, Athenaeus cites the *Περὶ Πινδάρου* of Chamaeleon, which stated that in Corinth there was the old custom of including prostitutes in prayers to Aphrodite in times of greatest difficulty. Chamaeleon puts forward an example of prayer to the goddess Protectress of the city during the Second Persian War, and, as a result of this, Simonides’ epigram composed to accompany the effigy of women (in his opinion prostitutes) who had raised the prayer, which was placed in a temple in memory of the victory.

¹ Chamaeleon is the only source for this epigram that mentions ἑταῖραι. The scholium on Pindar (to *Ol.* XIII.32b) and ps.-Plutarch (*De Herod. malign.* 39.871b), which differ greatly from Chamaeleon’s version (see Budin, pp. 335-346 and 352), refer to the prayer to Aphrodite (goddess not entirely divorced from a military characterization: see Budin, pp. 340-41 and

252 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

2 31-34, 36-45, 47-50, 54 *Pind. fr. 122 Snell-Mähler* 38-39 αἶ τε – θυμιᾶτε
cf. [Zon.]Lex. 1307 Tittmann nec non Phot. Lex. λ 292 Theodoridis ξανθὰ
 δάκρη *cf. Epim. Hom. δ 72 Dyck, vol. 2, p. 253*

4 τὰς *om. E* 12 *post* παρούσας *addendum* ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς *vel* ἐπὶ ταῖς
 θυσίαις *dub. putavit Kaibel* 14 πολιητᾶν *Kaibel* : πολινταν *A* 16
 τοξηφόροισιν *A* 32 κορᾶν ... ἐκατόγγυιον *Casaubon* : κόραν ... ἐκατονγύιον
A 33 Ξενοφῶν *Musurus* : ξενοφῶων *A* τελέαις *Boeckh* : τελείαις *A* 35
 τοῦ μέλους *Casaubon* : τοῦ τέλους *A* 36 πολύξεναι *Boeckh* : πολυξείναι
A 38 αἶ τε τὰς χλωρᾶς λιβάνου *Tittmann coll. Zonara p. 1307, n. 8* :
 διαιτε τασχειρας λιβανου *A* δάκρη *Schneidewin et Bergk coll. Cramer,*
Anecd. Ox. 1.121,1 : δάκρυα *A* 39 θυμιᾶτε *Tittmann coll. Zonara p. 1307,*
n. 8 (θυμιᾶται) : τε ἡμῖν *A* πολλάκι ματέρ' *Boeckh* : πολλάκις ματέρας
A οὐράνιαι πτάμεναι *Kaibel* : οὐρανίαῖ – πτάμεναι *A* 41 νοήματι πρὸς
Wilamowitz : νοήματι ποττᾶν *A*, νόημα ποττᾶν *Hermann*, νόημα πρὸς τὰν
Boeckh 42 ὕμνιν *Hermann*, ὕμνιν γ' *Turyn* ἄνευθ' ἐπαγορίας *Meineke*
 : ἄνωθ' ἀπαγορίας *A* 43 ἐν *add. Boeckh* 44 μαλθακᾶς ὥρας *Boeckh* :
 μαλθακωρας *A* 45 πᾶν καλόν *Schröder* : πάγκαλον *A* 46 δ' *Kaibel* : θ'
A 47 λεξόντι *Casaubon* : λεξοῦντι *A* Ἴσθμοῦ *Casaubon* : ὁμοῦ *A* 48
 τοιάνδε *Boeckh* : τοιόνδε *A* 54 διδάξαμεν *Hermann* : ἐδιδάξαμεν *A*,
 ἐδείξαμεν *Hecker* καθαρᾷ *Casaubon* : κιθάραι *A*, καθαρὸν *Meineke*

SIMONIDES

De quodam argute dicto Simonidis et de eius avaritia

Περὶ Σιμωνίδου

36 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.73 656c-e (*BT* vol. 3 p. 452.12-24 *Kaibel*)

33 w περὶ δὲ λαγῶν Χαμαιλέων φησὶν ἐν τῷ περὶ Σιμωνίδου
 656d ὥς δειπνῶν παρὰ τῷ Ἰέρωνι ὁ Σιμωνίδης, οὐ παρατεθέντος
 αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις λαγωῦ,
 ἀλλ' ὕστερον μεταδιδόντος τοῦ Ἰέρωνος, ἀπεσχεδίασεν·
 οὐδὲ γὰρ <οὐδ'> εὐρύς περ ἐὼν ἐξίκετο δεῦρο.

Bravi, p. 61 n. 114), which included Corinthian γυναῖκες, not prostitutes. Thus the epigram composed by Simonides, after the salvation assured to the city of Corinth by the goddess, was dedicated to these women. For this reason many critics, despite the weight given to Chamaeleon's statements, show more confidence in the story narrated by Theopompus. Not knowing or failing to take account of the story of Theopompus (see below, n. 2), however, Chamaeleon created the narrative on the worship of Aphrodite in Corinth by combining in his own way data coming from Simonides' epigram and from the Pindaric *skolion* on Xenocrates. See Budin, pp. 346-353, esp. 352.

² The mention of Theopompus and Timaeus seems not to come from the *Περὶ Πινδάρου* of Chamaeleon, but could be an addition of Athenaeus (who otherwise had a good knowledge of the two historians, see Zecchini, pp. 50-59 and 175-178). Some of the main features of the story of Theopompus, explicitly supported by the scholium to Pindar, are not recognizable in Chamaeleon's version. Otherwise, if Chamaeleon used the text of Timaeus and Theopompus as source for the epigram (see Bravi, p. 62), which shows some textual variants (see Budin, *passim*), he did not take into account some data that were explicitly expressed.

³ On this plaque and the effigies of women in the temple of Aphrodites see Bravi, pp. 62-63 and nn. 119-121.

⁴ Xenophon of Corinth, who won the running race and the pentathlon at Olympia in 464 BC (see *sch. in Pind. Ol.* 13, p. 356 Drachmann)

⁵ In the passage of Athenaeus with Simonides' epigram there is a *skolion* that Pindar composed for Xenophon, which testifies to the fact that the use of prostitutes in the prayer was an ἀρχαῖον νόμιμον demonstrated in other known events. But all these considerations seem the result of a compilation by Chamaeleon, according to his well-attested method of conflating different sources, rather than a real worship (see Schorn², in this volume, and Bravi, p. 62).

SIMONIDES

On the Wit and Avarice of Simonides

36 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.73 656c-e

About hares Chamaeleon says in his book *On Simonides* that when he was dining at the court of Hiero, when the hare was not served to him at the table as it was to the others, though Hiero later did offer it, he exclaimed, "Although it is indeed broad, it has not reached here." It is in fact true that Simonides

656e ὄντως δ' ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς κίμβιξ ὁ Σιμωνίδης καὶ αἰσχροκερδής, ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησίν. ἐν Συρακούσαις γοῦν τοῦ Ἰέρωνος ἀποστέλλοντος αὐτῷ τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς πωλῶν τὰ πλείω ὁ Σιμωνίδης τῶν παρ' ἐκείνου πεμπομένων ἑαυτῷ μικρὸν μέρος ἀπετίθετο. ἐρομένου δέ τινος τὴν αἰτίαν· “ὅπως”, εἶπεν, “ἢ τε Ἰέρωνος μεγαλοπρέπεια καταφανὴς ἢ καὶ ἡ ἐμὴ κοσμιότης”.

cf. *Eust. Odys. 1821.30, p. 147.13-16 Stallbaum* 1-5 *Simonides IEG fr. 26 West*² = *Simonides T 107 Poltera* 6-12 *Simonides T 96 Poltera* 6 cf. *Pind. Istm. 2.6-9 (= Simonides T 68a-b Poltera) et schol. 2.9a (= Simonides T 76b Poltera)*, vol. 3, p. 214 *Drachmann* *Aristoph. Pax 697-99 et scholia ad loc. (Simonides T 74 Poltera)* *Arist. Rhet. 2.16 1391a8 (= Simonides T 94 Poltera) nec non 3.2 1405b 23-29 (= Simonides F 2 Poltera)* *Sud. lex. σ 440 s.v. Σιμωνίδης POxy. XV 1800 col. II, 36-40 (= Simonides T 39a Poltera) (cuius notitiae fontem librum fuisse Chamaeleontis De Simonide suspic. Scorza, p. 22, vd. infra fr. dubium 59); de Simonidis avaritia cf. Simonidem T 74-77 et 97-98 Poltera*

1 λαγῶν aut λαγών *Lorenzoni*², p. 149 : λάγων *cett.* 5 οὐδ' *add. Musurus coll. Hom. Ξ 33*

Simonidis aenigmata duo

Περὶ Σιμωνίδου

37 *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 10.84 456c-457a (BT vol. 2 pp. 491.24-493.15 Kaibel)*

34 W γριφώδη δ' ἐστὶ καὶ Σιμωνίδη ταῦτα πεποιημένα, ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν τῷ περὶ Σιμωνίδου·
 μιξονόμου τε πατὴρ ἐρίφου καὶ σχέτλιος ἰχθύς
 πλησίον ἠρείσαντο καρήατα· παῖδα δὲ νυκτός
 δεξάμενοι βλεφάροισι Διωνύσοιο ἄνακτος 5
 βουφόνον οὐκ ἐθέλουσι τιθηνεῖσθαι θεράποντα.
 456d φασὶ δ' οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τινος τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀναθημάτων ἐν Χαλκίδι τοῦτ' ἐπιγεγράφθαι, πεποιῆσθαι δ' ἐν αὐτῷ τράγον καὶ δελφῖνα, περὶ ὧν εἶναι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον. οἱ δὲ εἰς ἐπιτόνιον ψαλτηρίου δελφῖνα καὶ τράγον εἰργασμένον 10 εἰρῆσθαι καὶ εἶναι τὸν βουφόνον καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου θεράποντα

was a skinflint¹ and shamefully greedy, as Chamaeleon says. In Syracuse, although Hiero provided his daily needs handsomely, Simonides sold most of what was sent to him by him and kept only a small part. When someone asked the reason, he said, “so that Hiero’s generosity may be manifest, and my orderliness.”²

¹ The epithet κίμβιξ seems to come from Xenophanes: see Poltera, p. 82 n. 47, Giordano², p. 171 and **51**. The occurrence of *kimbix* in association with *aischrokerdes* suggests also an ethical meaning and purpose for these biographical anecdotes on Simonides: see Arist. *Eth. Nich.* 4.3.38-39 1121b, pp. 74-75 Susemihl, *Eth. Eud.* 4.6 1232a, pp. 59-60 Susemihl, *Magna Moralia* 1.24 1192a, pp. 32-33 Susemihl. The proverbial attitude of Simonides for money and richness was well known by Aristotle and used as example: see *Rhet.* 2.16 1391a 8-12, p. 127 Susemihl.

² The passage of Athenaeus consists of two parts. Both are probably from the *Περὶ Σιμωνίδου* of Chamaeleon, but they were not necessarily contiguous. The first section describes a joke that the poet made during a banquet at the court of Hiero, evidently built with irony on *Iliad* 10.33 Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ’ εὐρύς περ ἔων ἐδυνήσατο πάσας as noted by Eustathius (see Koepke, p. 23; Scorza, p. 21; Steffen, p. 52; Marzullo, p. 74; Wehrli², p. 83; Giordano², p. 170). The second section, however, discusses the well-known *topos* of Simonides’ avarice, which is also attested by the biography contained in *POxy.* 1800, fr. 1, col. 2, ll. 36-40 and other sources (see app. loc. par.). See also **51**, **59** and Schorn², in this volume.

Two Enigmas of Simonides

37 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.84 456c-457a

Enigmatic are these things composed by Simonides, as Chamaeleon the Heracleot says in his book *On Simonides*: “A father of a promiscuously feeding kid and a wretched fish pressed their heads close together; but when they take in the child of night with their eyes they are not willing to tend to the ox-slaying servant of lord Dionysus.” Some say that this was inscribed on one of the old offerings in Chalcis and that a goat and a dolphin are portrayed in it, about whom this is the story. But others say the dolphin and the goat represent the tuning key of a harp and that the ox-slayer and servant of Dionysus is the dithyramb.

τὸν διθύραμβον. οἱ δὲ φασιν ἐν Ἰουλίδι τὸν τῷ Διονύσῳ
 θυόμενον βοῦν ὑπὸ τινος τῶν νεανίσκων παίεσθαι πελέκει.
 πλησίον δὲ τῆς ἐορτῆς οὔσης εἰς χαλκεῖον δοθῆναι τὸν
 πέλεκυν· τὸν οὖν Σιμωνίδην ἔτι νέον ὄντα βαδίσαι πρὸς 15
 τὸν χαλκέα κομιούμενον αὐτόν. ἰδόντα δὲ καὶ τὸν τεχνίτην
 κοιμώμενον καὶ τὸν ἄσκον καὶ τὸν καρκίνον εἰκῇ κείμενον
 456e καὶ ἐπαλλήλως ἔχοντα τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, οὕτως ἐλθόντα εἰπεῖν
 πρὸς τοὺς συνήθεις τὸ προειρημένον πρόβλημα. τὸν μὲν
 γὰρ τοῦ ἐρίφου πατέρα τὸν ἄσκον εἶναι, σχέτλιον δὲ 20
 ἰχθὺν τὸν καρκίνον, νυκτὸς δὲ παῖδα τὸν ὕπνον, βουφόνον
 δὲ καὶ Διονύσου θεράποντα τὸν πέλεκυν. πεποίηκε δὲ καὶ
 ἕτερον ἐπίγραμμα ὃ Σιμωνίδης, ὃ παρέχει τοῖς ἀπείροις
 τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπορίαν·

φημὶ τὸν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα φέρειν τέττιγος ἄεθλον 25
 τῷ Πανοπηιάδῃ δώσειν μέγα δεῖπνον Ἐπειῶ.

456f λέγεται δὲ ἐν τῇ Καρθαίᾳ διατρίβοντα αὐτὸν διδάσκειν
 τοὺς χορούς. εἶναι δὲ τὸ χορηγεῖον ἄνω πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνος
 ἱερῷ μακρὰν τῆς θαλάσσης. ὑδρεύεσθαι οὖν καὶ τοὺς
 ἄλλους καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Σιμωνίδην κάτῳθεν, ἔνθα ἦν ἡ 30
 κρήνη. ἀνακομίζοντος δ' αὐτοῖς τὸ ὕδωρ ὄνου, ὃν ἐκάλουν
 Ἐπειὸν διὰ τὸ μυθολογεῖσθαι τοῦτο δρᾶν ἐκείνον καὶ
 ἀναγεγράφθαι ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερῷ τὸν Τρωικὸν
 457a μῦθον, ἐν ᾧ ὃ Ἐπειὸς ὑδροφορεῖ τοῖς Ἀτρείδαις, ὥς καὶ
 Στησίχορός φησιν· 35

ῥκτειρε γὰρ αὐτὸν ὕδωρ
 ἀεὶ φορέοντα Διὸς κούρα βασιλεῦσιν.
 ὑπαρχόντων οὖν τούτων ταχθῆναί φασι τῷ μὴ παραγινομένῳ
 τῶν χορευτῶν εἰς τὴν ὠρισμένην ὥραν παρέχειν τῷ ὄνῳ
 χοίνικα κριθῶν. τοῦτ' οὖν κἂν τῷ ποιήματι λέγεσθαι, καὶ 40
 εἶναι τὸν μὲν οὐ φέροντα τὸ τοῦ τέττιγος ἄεθλον τὸν
 οὐκ ἐθέλοντα ἄδειν, Πανοπηιάδην δὲ τὸν ὄνον, μέγα δὲ
 δεῖπνον τὴν χοίνικα τῶν κριθῶν.

*Simonides T 108 Poltera 3-6 Simonides fr. 69 Diehl² 25-26 Simonides fr. 70
 Diehl² 36-37 Stesich. fr. 200 Davies*

3 πατήρ ἐρίφου C: πατήρ τ' ἐρίφου A 4 ἡρείσαντο C: ἡρίσαντο A 5
 Διονύσοιο C: Διονύσοιο A 10 ψαλτηρίου Schweighäuser: ψαλτήριον A

Still others say that in Iulis the ox being sacrificed to Dionysus is struck by one of the young men with an axe. Close to when the festival happens the axe is given to the smith. When he was young Simonides went to the smith when the latter was sleeping. Seeing that the tradesman was asleep and the bellows and tongs were lying in disorder with their fronts towards each other, he went to his companions and told the aforementioned riddle. For the bellows is the father of the kid and the wretched fish is the tongs (crab) and the child of night is sleep and the ox-slaying servant of Dionysus is the axe.

And Simonides composed another epigram, which poses a problem for those unversed in history: “I say that the one who is unwilling to bear away the prize of the cicada will give a great meal to the son of Panopeus, Epeius.”

It is said that in Carthaea he spent his time instructing choruses. The chorus area was near the temple of Apollo far from the sea. Therefore the others, and particularly those with Simonides, went down to where there was a spring to draw water. Since a donkey brought the water up for them, they called it Epeius because the story was told that he did this and in the temple of Apollo the Trojan story is inscribed, in which Epeius carries water for the Atreidae, as Stesichorus says: “For Zeus’s girl took pity on him forever carrying water for the kings.” This being the arrangement, they say that it was ordered for any member of the chorus not in attendance at the appointed time to offer a measure of barley for the donkey. So this is the meaning of the poem, and the one who does not bear away the prize of the cicada is the one who is unwilling to sing, and the donkey is the son of Panopeus, and the great meal is the measure of barley.¹

¹ Chamaeleon’s fragment is extracted from a long section of *The Sophists at Dinner* dedicated to riddles. Athenaeus compiled it by from various sources, such as the Peripatetic Clearchus of Soloi and Hermippus of Smyrna. It includes two riddles of Simonides, whose authenticity is doubtful, but Chamaeleon must have considered them genuine, drawing perhaps from a “more ancient tradition” (Scorza, p. 20 and, therein mentioned, for the opposite view, Reitzenstein, pp. 116-117) whose nature he does not reveal (see Koepke, p. 22). In both cases the explanation of Chamaeleon-Athenaeus is convincing (on this question see Giordano², pp. 172-173, Koepke, pp. 22-23, and Scorza, pp. 20-21). Using verses from the poet, Chamaeleon reconstructs features and events of Simonides’ biography. The fact, then, that Chamaeleon cites two

De Lacedaemoniis philosophiam et rhetoricam recusantibus

Περὶ Σιμωνίδου

38 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.92 611a (*BT* vol. 3 p. 347.26-348.4 Kaibel)

35 w εἰκότως οὖν πολλαὶ τῶν πόλεων καὶ μάλιστα ἡ Λακεδαιμονίων, ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησὶν ἐν τῷ περὶ Σιμωνίδου, οὐ προσίενται οὔτε <φιλοσοφίαν οὔτε> ῥητορικὴν διὰ τὰς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὑμῶν φιλοτιμίας καὶ ἔριδας καὶ τοὺς ἀκαίρους ἐλέγχους.

5

cf. *Sext. Emp. Adv. Math.* 2.20 1-3 *Simonides T21 Poltera*

3 οὔτε <φιλοσοφίαν οὔτε> ῥητορικὴν *suppl. Kaibel* : οὔτε ῥητορικὴν <οὔτε φιλοσοφίαν> *Musurus*

ANACREON

De Artemone

Περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος

39 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 12.46 533e-534b (*BT* vol. 3 p. 177.1-20 Kaibel)

36 w Χαμαιλέων δ' ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος προθεῖς τὸ

ξανθῇ δ' Εὐρυπύλῃ μέλει

ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων,

533f τὴν προσηγορίαν ταύτην λαβεῖν τὸν Ἀρτέμωνα διὰ τὸ 5
τρυφερῶς βιοῦντα περιφέρεσθαι ἐπὶ κλίνης. καὶ γὰρ Ἀνακρέων αὐτὸν ἐκ πενίας εἰς τρυφὴν ὁρμήσαί φησιν ἐν τούτοις·

additional verses from the Ἰλίου Πέρσις of Stesichorus on which to base his own opinion about the meaning of the name Epeius offers an example of a sort of ‘cross-confirmation’ (a poem is cited to confirm an opinion about another), a procedure Chamaeleon uses several times, thus expanding his ‘method’ (see 44-45 and Schorn², in this volume, *passim*).

On Spartans Who Rejects Philosophy and Rhetoric

38 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.92 611a

Therefore it is understandable that many cities, and particularly Lacedaemon, as Chamaeleon¹ says in his book *On Simonides*, do not allow either philosophy or rhetoric because of the rivalries in your speeches, and the quarrels and untimely refutations.

¹ Chamaeleon probably referred to Spartan hostility against sophistry in commenting on a Simonidean poem about a Spartan character or theme (see Koepke, p. 24, and Scorza, p. 22); but it is also possible that he compared Simonides with the Seven Wise Men (among whom Simonides was enumerated as Chamaeleon had to know), who were praised for wit and brevity, typical features of the Spartans which they achieved through rejecting rhetoric and philosophy (see Wehrli², p. 84, Steffen, p. 52, Giordano², p. 174).

ANACREON

Artemon

39 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 12.46 533e-534b

Chamaeleon of Pontus in the book *On Anacreon*, citing¹ the verse, “Litter-borne² Artemon is the care of blond Eurypyle,”³ gives this explanation: that Artemon was borne about on a litter while living luxuriously. For even Anacreon says in these lines that he leaped from poverty to luxury: “Earlier he had an old cap,

- πρὶν μὲν ἔχων βερβέριον, καλύμματ' ἐσφηκωμένα
καὶ ξυλίλους ἀστραγάλους ἐν ὥσιν καὶ ψιλὸν περὶ 10
πλευρῇσι <δέρριον> βοός,
νήπλυτον εἴλυμα κακῆς ἀσπίδος, ἀρτοπώλυσιν
534a κάθελοπόρνοισιν ὁμιλέων ὁ πονηρὸς Ἀρτέμων,
κίβδηλον εὐρίσκων βίον,
πολλὰ μὲν ἐν δουρὶ τιθεὶς αὐχένα, πολλὰ δ' ἐν τροχῷ, 15
πολλὰ δὲ νῶτον σκυτίνη μᾶστιγι θωμιχθεὶς, κόμην
πώγωνά τ' ἐκτετιλμένος·
νῦν δ' ἐπιβαίνει σατινέων χρύσεια φορέων καθέρματα,
παῖς Κύκης, καὶ σκιαδίσκην ἐλεφαντίνην φορέει
534b γυναιξὶν αὕτως. 20

vd. infra fr. incertum 50 nec non fr. dubium 60 cf. Heracl. Pont. fr. 45 Schütrumpf = fr. 60 Wehrli τοῦτο μὲν οὖν Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐλέγχει τοῖς Ἀνακρέοντος ποιήμασιν, ἐν οἷς ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων ὀνομάζεται πολλὰς ἔμπροσθεν ἡλικίας τοῦ περὶ Σάμου πολέμου καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκείνων ... περιφερομένον κομίζεσθαι καὶ διὰ τούτου κληθῆναι περιφόρητον *CPG App. 4.32, vol. 1, p. 441 Leutsch-Schneidewin* ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων· ἐπὶ τῶν πάνυ ποθουμένων. φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι νεανίσκος ὁ Ἀρτέμων ἐγένετο περιμάχητος γυναιξίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι μηχανοποιὸς ἐγένετο σοφώτατος κατὰ τοὺς Περικλέους χρόνους· χωλὸς δὲ ὢν περιεφέρετο ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρῳ τὰς μηχανάς. *Zenob. Ath. I.64 p. 356 Miller, Mélanges de Litt. Gr.* ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων· μέμνηται ταύτης Δίφιλος ἐν Ἐμπόρῳ (*PCG 372 K.-A.*) καὶ Ἀνακρέων (*fr. 8 Gentili*). τάττεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν πάνυ ποθουμένων *Aristoph. Acharn. 850* οὐδ' ὁ περιπόνηρος Ἀρτέμων *et schol. Aristoph. Acharn. 850a Wilson* οὐδ' ὁ περιπόνηρος· ὥσει ἔλεγεν ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων, ἀπὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ἧς μέμνηται καὶ Ἀνακρέων ταχθείσης ἐπὶ καλοῦ καὶ ἀρπαζομένου πρὸς πάντων παιδός. ... συνεχρόνισε δὲ τῷ δικαίῳ Ἀριστείδῃ οὗτος ὁ Ἀρτέμων, ὅς ἦν ἄριστος μηχανητής. διὰ δὲ τὸ χωλὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, ... μετεπέμποντο αὐτὸν φερόμενον. ἀπὸ τούτου οὖν ἡ παροιμία. καὶ πάντες οἱ σοφοὶ περιφόρητοι καλοῦνται *Hesych. Lex. π 1831 Hansen* ὁ περιπόνηρος Ἀρτέμων (*Aristoph. Acharn. 850*)· παρὰ τὴν παροιμίαν τὴν “περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων”. εἰσὶ δὲ Ἀρτέμονες δύο 3-4 *Anacreon fr. 8 Gentili* 9-20 *Anacreon fr. 82 Gentili*

9 κερβέριον *Schweighäuser* 10-11 ψιλὸν μὲν ἔχων πλευρῇσι βοός (*omissis verbis quae antecedunt*) *epitom.* 11 <δέρριον> *Bergk¹ coll. Hesych. s.v. δέρριον, δέρμ' ἔχων Meineke, <δερμῖον> Blass, <δέρμ' ἦει> vel <δέρμ' ἔβη> Bergk⁴ qui verbum finitum requirit* 12 νήπλυτον *Schoemann* : νεόπλυτον *A, νεόπλυτον epitom.* 13 κάθελ. *Bergk* : καὶ ἐθέλ. *A, epitom.* ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων *Musurus* : ὁ περιφόρητος ὁ Ἀρτέμων *A* 14 εὐρίσκειν *Blass* 15

a waspy hood, wooden dice in his ears and a bare ox-hide around his ribs, the unwashed wrapping of a poor shield, the wretch Artemon, conversing with bread-women and willing prostitutes, making a life of fraud, often having put his neck in stocks, often on the wheel, often having been flogged in the back with a leather strap, his hair and beard plucked. But now he mounts a chariot wearing golden necklaces, a child of Cyce, and carries an ivory sunshade, just like women.”

¹ On the translation of προθείς and its implications in determining the ‘method of Chamaeleon’ see Schorn², in this volume, and Arrighetti⁶, pp. 66-67.

² The adjective περιφόρητος may mean “portable, carried around / about” if one remains faithful to the true sense of the compound of φορέω/φέρω, or it may mean “known, noted”, if one accepts his metaphorical meaning attested in *CPG App.* 4.32 (see app. loc. par.). In Anacreon’s fragment, despite the brief exegesis that Athenaeus draws from Chamaeleon, the second meaning (‘known, noted’ and, with a further metaphor, ‘wanted, contended’) is usually preferred (see the heading ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων of the Bodleian Appendix to the *corpus* of Greek Paroemiographers and Zenobius; see app. loc. par.), since the infamous Artemon mentioned by Anacreon seems to have had no scruples in making himself ‘known’ to a large number of women (and perhaps men) of his time, although we cannot exclude at all that the first meaning (“portable, carried around”) does not play, according to Anacreon’s irony, an important role and that both meanings were known to Chamaeleon. On this subject see Martano, pp. 31-35, Schorn¹, pp. 63-67 and Ροζοκοκη, pp. 193-94 and 207-8. On this fragment see also Schorn², in this volume.

³ Eurypyle could have been a *hetaira* and probably had a preeminent position in Anacreon’s poems (see Martano, p. 28 n. 10).

δεθείς *Cobet* 16 δὲ νῶτον σκυτίνη *Elmsley* (*sed* νῶτα), *Bergk* : δ' ἐν ὥτῳ σκυτινῷ *A* 16-17 πολλάκις δὲ κόμην πώγωνά τι τ' ἐκτετιλμένος *epitom.* 18 φορέων *Casaubon* : φαρέων *A* 19 πάις *Dindorf, cf. Archil. POxy. 2313, fr. 1 (a), 6 (fr. 114.11 Tarditi)* : παῖς *A* φορέει *Elmsley* : φορεῖ *A* 20 αὐτῶς *Kaibel, Bergk* <ἐμφερής> *post* αὐτῶς *Schoemann*, <ταῖς ἀβραῖς> *Rupprecht*

DRAMA SATYRICUM

Proverbium ex Aristiae Cyclope

Περὶ σατύρων

40A *Apostolius, Cent. 3.60 (CPG vol. 2, pp. 300.12-301.3 Leutsch)*

37a W ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ· αὕτη γέγονεν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀριστίου Κύκλωπος, ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ σατύρων. καὶ Πολύφημος οὕτω φησὶ πρὸς Ὀδυσσέα ἐν Κύκλωπι δράματι λεγομένῳ. λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν τοῖς καλοῖς τὰ χεῖρῳ ἐπιμιγνύντων.

5

cf. Diogenian. 2.32, vol. 1, p. 200 Leutsch-Schneidewin ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ: ἐπὶ τῶν τοῖς καλοῖς τὰ χεῖρονα προσμιγνύντων· ἐν Κύκλωπος δράματι λεγομένῳ οὕτω φησὶ πρὸς Ὀδυσσέα Πολύφημος *Zenob. 2.16, vol. 1, p. 35 Leutsch-Schneidewin* ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ: ἐν Κύκλωπι δράματι Πολύφημος οὕτως πρὸς Ὀδυσσέα λέγει, ὅθεν εἰς παροιμίαν περιέστη *nec non Ath. Deipn. 8.362a 1 Aristias TrGF 9 F4 Snell-Kannicht 3-5 cf. Eur. Cycl. 557-558*

4 Κύκλωπι *Lorenzoni* : Κύκλωπος *codd.*

Περὶ σατύρων

40B *Sud.lex. s.v. ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ (A 3668, LG I.1, p. 330.21-5 Adler)*

37b W ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ· ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ καλῶς πρότερον γεινόμενα ὕστερον μικροῦ τινος ἔνεκεν κακοῦ ἀνατρεπόντων. ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ἃ χαρίζονται δολούντων καὶ μὴ ἀκέραια παρεχομένων. αὕτη δὲ ἡ παροιμία γέγονεν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀριστίου Κύκλωπος, ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ σατύρων.

5

1 *Aristias TrGF 9 F4 Snell-Kannicht*

3 χαρίζονται *A* : χωρίζονται *M* δολούντων *A* : δηλούντων *F*, δουλούντων *M*

SATYR PLAY

A Saying from Aristias' *Cyclops*

40A Apostolius, *Cent.* 3.60

“You destroyed the wine by pouring water in it.” This saying originated in the *Cyclops* of Aristias, as Chamaeleon says in his book *About Satyr Plays*. Polyphemus also speaks this way to Odysseus in the play called *Cyclops*. It is said with reference to those who mix worse things with good.¹

¹ The context of the fragment is very limited, as already noted by Scorza, p. 31, but it demonstrates Chamaeleon's interest in the genre of satyr play, whose origins, evolution, and leading figures he could perhaps have examined. This content may be deduced by analogy from the fragments of *Περὶ Θεσπίδος* (41), where Chamaeleon examines the beginnings of tragedy as resulting from satyr plays (according to the Aristotelian doctrine of *Poet.* 4.1449a 20-22, see Giordano², pp. 176-77), of *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου*, where he seems to quote from a satyr play of Aeschylus and describe the characteristics of its stage performances (42, 44, 45), and the fact that he wrote a treatise of the same kind, but dedicated to comedy (46 and 47), in which he seems to spread out to describe the characteristics of two comic playwrights.

40B Suda, under *apolesas ton oinon epikeas hudor*

“You destroyed the wine by pouring water in it.” With regard to those who upset things that were previously going well because of some small fault. Or, with regard to those who play tricks whenever it pleases them and who do not deal with things in a sincere way. This saying originated in the *Cyclops* of Aristias, as Chamaeleon says in his book *About Satyr Plays*.¹

¹ In Adler's opinion, the fragments 40B and 40C, from the Suda, derive from a collections of sayings, perhaps that of Diogenianus, as the occurrence of

Περὶ σατύρων

40C *Sud.lex.* s.v. Ἀρίστιος Κύκλωψ (A 3907, *LG* I.1, p. 354.21 Adler, ex A 3668)

37c W Ἀρίστιος Κύκλωψ· μέμνηται τούτου Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ σατύρων.

post 390b A : om. GTF, post 3904 VM, post 3905 I

40D Photius, *Lexicon* s.v. ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ (no. 2561, vol. 1, p. 237.3-5 Theodoridis)

ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ· αὕτη γέγονεν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀριστίου Κύκλωπος, ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων.

1 γέγονεν *Theodoridis* : γέγος Z 2 Ἀριστίου *Theodoridis recte in app. coll. Sud.lex.* α 3668.24 : † Ἀρίστου † *in textu Z secutus*

THESPIS

“Nihil ad Dionysum”

Περὶ Θέσπιδος

41 *Sud.lex.* s.v. οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον (O 806, *LG* I.3, p. 579.1-8 Adler)

38 W οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον· Ἐπιγένους τοῦ Σικυωνίου τραγωδίαν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον <οὐκ ἀνήκουσαν> ποιήσαντος ἐπεφώνησάν τινες τοῦτο· ὅθεν ἡ παροιμία. βέλτιον δὲ οὕτως. τὸ πρόσθεν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον γράφοντες τούτοις ἡγωνίζοντο, ἅπερ καὶ Σατυρικὰ ἐλέγετο· ὕστερον δὲ 5 μεταβάντες εἰς τὸ τραγωδίας γράφειν κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς μύθους καὶ ἱστορίας ἐτράπησαν, μηκέτι τοῦ Διονύσου μνημονεύοντες· ὅθεν τοῦτο καὶ ἐπεφώνησαν. καὶ Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ Θέσπιδος τὰ παραπλήσια ἱστορεῖ.

Paus. Attic. ο 32.1-6 *Erbse Phot. Lex.* s.v. Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον, vol. 2, p. 35, ll. 2-9 *Naber, sed cf. etiam Zenob. 5.40, vol. 1, p. 137 Leutsch-*

the same lemma, without the name of Chamaeleon, in Diogen. 2.32 suggests. This would not be the only such case of Chamaeleon, mediated by another source, in collections of sayings: see **39**, **41** and **48**.

40C Suda, under *Aristios Kyklops*

“Aristius the Cyclops.” Chamaeleon recalls him in the book *On Satyr Plays*.

40D Photius, under *apolesas ton oinon epikeas hudor*

“You destroyed the wine by pouring water in it.” This saying originated in the *Cyclops* of Aristias, as Chamaeleon says.

THESPIS

“Nothing To Do with Dionysus”

41 Suda, under *Ouden pros ton Dionyson*

“Nothing to do with Dionysus”:¹ Certain people exclaimed this after Epigenes of Sicyon² had composed a tragedy in honor of Dionysus; hence the saying. But the following is better. Formerly, when writing in honor of Dionysus they competed with these (compositions), which also used to be called *satyrika*. But later on, having progressed to writing tragedies, they turned gradually to myths and historical subjects, no longer with Dionysus in mind, whereupon they also exclaimed this. And Chamaeleon in *On Thespis* relates similar things.³

¹ For a detailed analysis of this saying and its exegesis see Ieranò, pp. 205-206.

² On Epigenes, tragic poet of the first generation, see *RE* VI, s.v. “Epigenes” (12), col. 64 (Dieterich) and Mirhady, in this volume.

Schneidewin Οὐδέν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον· ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις λεγόντων ἢ παροιμία εἴρηται. ἐπειδὴ τῶν χορῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰθισμένων διθύραμβον ᾄδειν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον, οἱ ποιηταὶ ὕστερον ἐκβάντες τὴν συνήθειαν ταύτην, Αἴαντας καὶ Κενταύρους γράφειν ἐπεχείρουν. ὅθεν οἱ θεώμενοι σκώπτοντες ἔλεγον· “Οὐδέν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον”. διὰ γοῦν τοῦτο τοὺς Σατύρους ὕστερον ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς προεισάγειν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσι ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ *Diogenian. 7.18, vol. 1, p. 289 Leutsch-Schneidewin* Οὐδέν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον· ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα φλυαρούντων. πρῶτον γὰρ τὰ Διονύσου ᾄδοντες οἱ ποιηταὶ, ὕστερον κατεφρόνουν. οἱ οὖν τοῦ Διονυσίου ἔλεγον, Οὐδέν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον *Apostolium cent. 13.42 Arist. Poet. 4 1449a 20-25 nec non [Plut.] De prov. Alexandr. 30 pp. 15-16 Crusius* τὰ μηδέν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον· τὴν κωμωδίαν καὶ τὴν τραγωδίαν ἀπὸ γέλωτος εἰς τὸν ἴβιον φασὶ παρελθεῖν. καὶ <γὰρ> κατὰ καιρὸν τῆς συγκομιδῆς τῶν γενημάτων παραγενομένους τινὰς ἐπὶ τὰς ληνοὺς καὶ τοῦ γλεύκους πίνοντας [ποιήματα τινα] σκώπτειν· <ὕστερον δὲ σκωπτικὰ> | ποιήματά τινα | καὶ γράφειν, <ᾶ> διὰ τὸ πρότερον ἐν <κώμας ᾄδεσθαι> κωμωδίαν καλεῖσθαι. ἤρχοντο δὲ καὶ συνεχέστερον εἰς τὰς κώμας τὰς Ἀττικὰς γύψω τὰς ὄψεις κεχρισμένοι καὶ ἔσκωπτον. * * * τραγικὰ παρεισφέροντες, <ἐπὶ τὸ> αὐστηρότερον μετῆλθον * * * ταῦτα οὖν καὶ ἐπεὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ πολέμιόν ἐστίν ὁ τράγος ἐπισκώπτοντές τινες ἔλεγον. * * * ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ ἀνοίκειά τισι προσφερόντων *de Epigene et Thespi primis poetis tragicis cf. Sud.lex. θ 282 Adler s.v. Θέσπεις*

2 οὐκ ἀνήκουσαν *add. Erbse e.g. ad Paus. Attic. ο 32, Untersuchungen p. 201 app.*

AESCHYLUS

De porculo coquendo

Περὶ Αἰσχύλου

42 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.17 375d-f (*BT* vol. 2, p. 320.14-26 Kaibel)

39 W Αἰσχύλος δέ φησιν·
375e ἐγὼ δὲ χοῖρον καὶ μάλ' εὐθηλούμενον
τόνδ' ἐν νοτοῦντι κριβάνῳ θήσω. τί γὰρ
ὄψον γένοιτ' ἂν ἀνδρὶ τοῦδε βέλτιον;
καὶ πάλιν·

³ The fragment refers to the origins of tragedy and its development from the satyr play (Chamaeleon is of the same opinion of Aristotle, see *Poet.* 4 1449a, 20-25; Giordano², p. 177). In opposition to Scorza, pp. 32-33, (see also Giordano, pp. 177-178), the two interpretations given by the *Suda* (the first that the sentence was used to criticize a tragedy of Epigenes of Sicyon dedicated to Dionysus but apparently not about him; a second about the evolution of satyr plays into tragedy and their gradual progression from cultal themes into mythical and historical ones) are not alternatives or opposed and both could go back to Chamaeleon. If the former, in fact, it refers only to Epigenes and to the production of a specific, if not specifically named, tragedy, the second would refer to tragedy as a whole and to an undefined number of poets: this would seem, along with other sources at our disposal, which mention also Aeschylus and Phrynichus (Plut., *QC* 1.1 615A) in a similar context. Note that the first interpretation refers not to Thespis (the subject of Chamaeleon's work cited), but to Epigenes, his contemporary and an innovative tragic poet himself, who competed with Thespis for chronological primacy in the genre: see the lemma Θέσπις in the *Suda Lexicon* (see app. loc. par.), deriving from Hesychius of Miletus, and Mirhady, in this volume.

AESCHYLUS

On Cooking a Piglet

42 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.17 375d-f

Aeschylus says, "I shall place this well suckled pig in a roaring oven. For what roast would be better for a man than this one?"

λευκός· τί δ' οὐχί; καὶ καλῶς ἠφευμένος·
 ὁ χοῖρος ἔψου μηδὲ λυπηθῆς πυρί.
 καὶ ἔτι·

θύσας δὲ χοῖρον τόνδε τῆς αὐτῆς ὑός,
 ἢ πολλά μ' ἐν δόμοισιν εἴργασται κακά,
 δονοῦσα καὶ τρέπουσα τύρβ' ἄνω κάτω.
 375f ταῦτα δὲ παρέθετο Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ Αἰσχύλου.

2-4 Aesch. TrGF F 309 Radt 6-7 Aesch. TrGF F 310 Radt 7 cf. Eust. Iliad.
 1286.20 εὔρηται δὲ καὶ παθητικὴ μετοχὴ τοῦ τοιούτου ῥήματος ἐν τῷ
 'λεπτὸς καὶ καλὸς ἠφεύμενος' 9-11 Aesch. TrGF F 311 Radt

10 μ' Porson : γ' A multi multa emendare tempt.: vide Radt ad frr. 309, 310
 et 311

Ebrius Aeschylus tragoedias componebat
 primusque heroas ebrios in scaenam adduxit

Περὶ Αἰσχύλου

43A Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.33 428f-429a (BT vol. 2 p.
 432.18-28 Kaibel)

40a W ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν Αἰσχύλον ἐγὼ φαίην ἂν τοῦτο διαμαρτάνειν·
 πρῶτος γὰρ ἐκεῖνος καὶ οὐχ, ὡς ἔνιοί φασιν, Εὐριπίδης
 παρήγαγε τὴν τῶν μεθύνων ὄψιν εἰς τραγωδίαν. ἐν γὰρ
 τοῖς Καβείροις εἰσάγει τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἰάσωνα μεθύοντας.
 ἃ δ' αὐτὸς ὁ τραγωδοποιὸς ἐποίει, ταῦτα τοῖς ἥρωσι 5
 περιέθηκε· μεθύων γοῦν ἔγραφε τὰς τραγωδίας. διὸ καὶ
 Σοφοκλῆς αὐτῷ μεμφόμενος ἔλεγεν ὅτι· “ὦ Αἰσχύλε, εἰ
 429a καὶ τὰ δέοντα ποιεῖς, ἀλλ' οὖν οὐκ εἰδώς γε ποιεῖς”, ὡς
 ἱστορεῖ Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ Αἰσχύλου.

Aesch. TrGF T 117a Radt cf. Plut. fr. 130 Sandbach (= TrGF T 117d
 Radt) Plut. QC 1.5.1.622e (= TrGF T 117f Radt) nec non 7.10.2.715d (= TrGF
 T 117g Radt, locum Chamaeleonti tribuendum secundum Pfeiffer 1968, p. 281,
 vd. infra fr. dubium 62) Lucian. Dem. enc. 15 Eust. Odyss. 1598.58 (TrGF
 T 117c Radt) Stob. Anth. 18.33 2-3 Euripidis testimonium non inveni 4 de
 Cabiriis cf. TrGF pp. 214-216 Radt 6-9 Soph. TrGF T52a Radt Ion Chius
 fr. dub. 137 Leurini

1 τοῦτό γε C 4 Καβίροις A Ἰάσωνα A

And again, “White; Why not? And well cooked. The pig cooks and doesn’t feel pain in the fire.” And also, “Having sacrificed this pig, from the same sow that has done much damage to my house, shaking and turning uproar up and down.” Chamaeleon adds these things in the work *On Aeschylus*.¹

¹ In a discussion about the names of pigs and their uses in sacrifices, Athenaeus cites three fragments of Aeschylus, extracted probably from a satyr play (Koepke, pp. 35-36, and recently, Radt, vol. 3, p. 397 *app.* to fr. 309) in the *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου* of Chamaeleon. The most widely accepted interpretation, based on other examples cited by Athenaeus, is that here Chamaeleon demonstrates the poet’s interest in food with a quotation taken from a verse of his work. Elsewhere, albeit on different bases, he shows his interest in wine (see **43A** and **43B**, and Koepke, p. 35, Scorza, p. 36, Wehrli², p. 85, and Giordano², p. 39; only Steffen, p. 54, states “ex Athenaei verbis evinci non potest, ad quam rem probandam Chamaeleon Aeschyli versus exscripserit”).

Aeschylus Wrote Tragedies while Drunk and Was the First to Set Drunk Heroes on the Stage

43A Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.33 428f-429a

I would say that even Aeschylus made this mistake. For he was the first, and not as some say, Euripides, to bring the spectacle of drunks into tragedy. For in the *Cabiri*¹ he depicts the companions of Jason drunk, and what the composer of tragedy did himself he applied to the heroes.² In short, he wrote his tragedies while drunk. Therefore Sophocles criticized him and said, “Aeschylus, even if you write what you must, still, you don’t do it consciously.”³ So Chamaeleon reports in the work *On Aeschylus*.⁴

In a section on the power of wine, Athenaeus cites this passage from Chamaeleon’s *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου*, in which the Heracleot connects, perhaps rashly, the propensity to drink of Aeschylus (see *TrGF* 117e = Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124 F46) and an apostrophe of Sophocles to the poet of Eleusis: see Radt, vol. 3, p. 71, *app.* to fr. 117.

¹ The drama seems to have been devoted to the story of the Argonauts, as one may argue from this fragment, and it has been proposed that it was a satyr play: see Radt, vol. 3 pp. 214-15.

² The propensity to drink of Aeschylus is demonstrated, in the spirit of the ‘method of Chamaeleon’, by the recurrence in his tragedies of drunken characters. See Mirhady, *passim*, and Schorn², in this volume.

43B Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 1.39 22a (*BT* vol. 1 p. 48.19-21 Kaibel)

40b W μεθύων δὲ ἐποίει τὰς τραγωδίας Αἰσχύλος, ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων· Σοφοκλῆς γοῦν ὠνείδιζεν αὐτῷ ὅτι εἰ καὶ τὰ δέοντα ποιεῖ, ἀλλ’ οὐκ εἰδώς γε.

Aesch. TrGF T 117b Radt 2 Soph. TrGF T52b Radt

2 γοῦν *Dindorf*: οὔν *A C*

De Aeschyli figuris saltationis

44 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 1.39 21d-f (*BT* vol. 1 pp. 47.11-48.4 Kaibel)

41 W καὶ Αἰσχύλος δὲ οὐ μόνον ἐξεῦρε τὴν τῆς στολῆς
21e εὐπρέπειαν καὶ σεμνότητα, ἣν ζηλώσαντες οἱ ἱεροφάνται καὶ δαδοῦχοι ἀμφιέννυνται, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὰ σχήματα ὀρχηστικὰ αὐτὸς ἐξευρίσκων ἀνεδίδου τοῖς χορευταῖς. Χαμαιλέων γοῦν πρῶτον αὐτόν φησι σχηματίσαι τοὺς 5
χοροὺς ὀρχηστοδιδασκάλοις οὐ χρησάμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν τοῖς χοροῖς τὰ σχήματα ποιῶντα τῶν ὀρχήσεων,

³ Koepke, pp. 33-35, believed that the words of Sophocles should not be connected with the unconsciousness caused by the abuse of wine, but with the state of ἐνθουσιασμός of the poet who, possessed by divinity, becomes his medium (see Wehrli², p. 85 and Giordano², p. 179; more cautiously Steffen, p. 55). Differently Scorza, p. 35: “Non mi pare opportuno ricorrere a tante sottigliezze: le parole di Sofocle e tutto l’aneddoto possono essere stati creati più tardi dai posteri, ma in ogni caso io credo che la frase di Sofocle abbia il significato che ad essa dà appunto Cameleonte, ed è una prova del solito malumore che vi è sempre fra due poeti che si trovano a vivere in un medesimo periodo, a gareggiare insieme e a vedere preferite alle proprie opere le opere dell’altro.” See Arrighetti⁴, pp. 148ff., for correspondence between the ἦθος of the author and the content of his work.

⁴ Scorza, pp. 35-36, removes any possible doubt that it can come from the Περὶ μέθης, despite the contiguity with **12** of this edition and the argument treated. On the other hand, the example of Aeschylus could be useful in the discussion about drunkenness, which had to find a place in the monograph on the poet of Eleusis. In the absence of conflicting data, it is better to follow the explicit indication of Athenaeus.

43B Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 1.39 22a

But Aeschylus composed his tragedies while drunk, as Chamaeleon says. However, Sophocles criticized him because even if he composed what was necessary, he did it in ignorance.

On the Dance Forms of Aeschylus

44 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 1.39 21d-f

And Aeschylus invented not only the decorousness and solemnity of the gown that hierophants and torchbearers emulate when they dress, but many other dance forms that he himself invented and passed down to members of his choruses. Chamaeleon, at any rate, says he was the first to choreograph choruses without using dance teachers, but by creating the dance forms for the choruses himself and in general taking the entire

καὶ ὅλως πᾶσαν τὴν τῆς τραγωδίας οἰκονομίαν εἰς ἑαυτὸν
περιστᾶν. ὑπεκρίνετο γοῦν μετὰ τοῦ εἰκότος τὰ δράματα,
21f Ἀριστοφάνης γοῦν – παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἢ περὶ 10
τῶν τραγικῶν ἀπόκειται πίστις – ποιεῖ αὐτὸν Αἰσχύλον
λέγοντα·

τοῖσι χοροῖς αὐτὸς τὰ σχήματ' ἐποίουν
καὶ πάλιν·

τοὺς Φρύγας οἶδα θεωρῶν, 15
ὅτε τῷ Πριάμῳ συλλυσόμενοι τὸν παῖδ' ἦλθον τεθνεῶτα
πολλὰ τοιαυτὶ καὶ τοιαυτὶ καὶ δεῦρο σχηματίσαντας.

*Aesch. TrGF T103 Radt 3-7 cf. Plat. QC 8.9.3 732f et Ath. Deipn. 1.22a 9 cf.
Soph. TrGF T 1.22 Radt 13 Aristoph. PCG fr. 696a K.-A. 15-17 Aristoph.
PCG fr. 696b K.-A.*

5 γοῦν *Musurus* : οὖν *C E* 5-6 τοὺς χοροὺς *C E* : τοὺς <γὰρ> χοροὺς
Bergk 8 εἰς αὐτὸν *E* 9 περιστᾶν *Usener ap. Kaibel III, p. V* : περιστάντα
C E 10-11 περὶ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς *E* 11 ἀπόκειται *in marg. add. E* 16
συλλησόμενοι *C* 17 καὶ δεῦρο *non intellegit Kaibel qui* πολλὰ τοιαυτὶ
τηδὶ κάκεῖ καὶ δεῦρο (*vel* δευρὶ) σχηματίσαντας *coll. Arist. Av. 425 tempt.*

TRAGOEDIA

Prisca cum cantu nobilis saltatio in tragoediis

45 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.25 628d-e (*BT* vol. 3 p. 386.20-
387.10 Kaibel)

42 w καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὀρχήσει καὶ πορεία καλὸν μὲν εὐσχημοσύνη
καὶ κόσμος, αἰσχροὺς δὲ ἀταξία καὶ τὸ φορτικόν. διὰ τοῦτο

management of the tragedy upon himself.¹ Therefore it seems likely that he acted in his own plays. Indeed, Aristophanes writes in his plays, realistically – comic playwrights are credible concerning tragic playwrights² – and has Aeschylus say, “I created forms for the choruses,” and again, “as a spectator I saw (Aeschylus’) *Phrygians*³ when they came with Priam to ransom his dead son: they did many dance forms in this way, in that way, and back.”⁴

¹ There is no doubt in attributing this fragment to the *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου*, although Chamaeleon’s quotation is not explicit. Pickard-Cambridge, p. 197, denies that Chamaeleon mentioned costumes, and therefore does not attribute the first sentence to the Heracleot (of the opposite opinion Koepke, p. 33).

² On Aeschylus’ *Phrygians*, tragedy inspired to the episode of *Iliad* Ω, see *TrGF* vol. 3, pp. 364-66 Radt.

³ Note that similar information about the invention of figures of dance and teaching them to the chorus is attributed to the poets Phrynichus, Thespis and Pratinas by Plut., *QC* 8.9.3 732f and Ath., *Deipn.* 1.39 22a (see Koepke, p. 33; Scorza, p. 34; Wehrli², p. 86; Giordano², p. 180), while the entire βίος anonymously placed before the tragedies of Aeschylus and published at last by Radt, insists on the innovative features of the Aeschylean theater in clear agreement with the statement made by Aristophanes in *Frogs*. Scorza, p. 34, believed that the quotation of Aristophanes was an addition of Athenaeus. Pickard-Cambridge, pp. 197-98, remains doubtful (“the last sentence of the passage seems to imply that, whether for himself [*scil.* Athenaeus] or for Chamaeleon, the recognized authority on Aeschylus was the *Frogs* of Aristophanes”), while Arrighetti⁴, p. 148, considers, probably correctly, the Aristophanes passage to be from Chamaeleon and useful in showing the so-called ‘method of Chamaeleon’: “A questa conclusione (*scil.* l’invenzione di nuove figure di danza) Cameleonte arrivava sulla base di due citazioni di Aristofane, citazioni che accompagnava con la famosa dichiarazione programmatica *παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἢ περὶ τῶν τραγικῶν ἀποκεῖται πίστις*.” On this fragment see Mirhady, in this volume.

⁴ About the comedy from which these verses came see *PCG*, vol 3.2, p. 358 K.-A.

TRAGEDY

Ancient Noble Dance with Singing in Tragedies

45 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.25 628d-e

For in dance and in bearing, good form and order are beautiful, but disarray and vulgarity are shameful. For because of this the

γὰρ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς συνέταπτον οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῖς ἐλευθέροις
τὰς ὀρχήσεις καὶ ἐχρῶντο τοῖς σχήμασι σημείοις μόνον 5
τῶν ἀδομένων, τηροῦντες αἰεὶ τὸ εὐγενὲς καὶ ἀνδρώδες
ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, ὅθεν καὶ ὑπορχήματα τὰ τοιαῦτα προσηγόρευον.
628e εἰ δέ τις ἀμέτρως διαθείη τὴν σχηματοποιίαν καὶ ταῖς
ῥαῖς ἐπιτυχάνων μηδὲν λέγοι κατὰ τὴν ὀρχησιν, οὗτος
δ’ ἦν ἀδόκιμος. διὸ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ Πλάτων ἐν ταῖς
Σκευαῖς, ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησὶν, εἶρηκεν οὕτως· 10
ὥστ’ εἴ τις ὀρχοῖτ’ εὖ, θέαμ’ ἦν· νῦν δὲ δρῶσιν οὐδέν,
ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἀπόπληκτοι στάδην ἐστῶτες ὠρύονται.
ἦν γὰρ τὸ τῆς ὀρχήσεως γένος τῆς ἐν τοῖς χοροῖς
εὐσχημον τότε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ὥσανεὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς
ὅπλοις κινήσεις ἀπομιμούμενον. 15

11-12 *Plato com. PCG 138 K.-A., vol. 7, p. 490* 13-15 *cf. Eust. Iliad. 1078.25, v. 3, p. 906 Van der Valk, addit. ex Athen. Deipn. loco hoc*

11 ὀρχοῖτ’ *Musurus* : ὀρχοῖθ’ *A* οὐδέν *E* : οὐθέν *A* 15 ἀπομιμούμενον *E* : ἀπομιμουμένων *A*

poets, even from the beginning, organized the dances for the free and used forms only as signs of self-respecting people, always preserving nobility and manliness in them, which is why they called such things *hyporchemata* (supportive dances). But if someone did choreography unrestrainedly or said something with the songs that did not coordinate with the dances, he was discredited. Therefore Aristophanes, or Platon in the *Costumes*, as Chamaeleon claims,¹ said as follows: “so if they danced well, it was a show; but now they do nothing but howl, standing still as if they were paralyzed.” For the type of dancing of the choruses then had good form and decorum, as if imitating the movements among men-at-arms.²

The fragment is attributed to *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου* by Wehrli², p. 86, (followed by Steffen, p. 55, and Giordano², p. 180) by analogy with **44** and with the ancient tradition on features of Aeschylean drama. Koepke, p. 37, is of a different opinion: he focuses on music, which he thinks is the focus of the *Προτρεπτικός* <περὶ μουσικῆς> (see **4** n. 2), and attributes the fragment to this work. Scorza, pp. 30-31, following Meineke (*Analect. crit. ad Ath. Deipn.*, Leipzig, 1867, p. 184), considers the quotation of Platon’s *Σκευαί* (a comedy dedicated to the performing arts), and attributes it instead to the *Περὶ κωμωδίας*.

¹ As already noted Scorza, p. 30, and Giordano², p. 181, Chamaeleon discusses the degeneration of *hyporchemata* in the dramatic poets of the fourth century, and, as is well noted by Giordano², p. 181, the lines of Platon’s comedy “suonano come rimpianto della compostezza e gravità delle corodie accompagnate dalla danza mimetica”, as it was in Aeschylus’ dramas. See Mirhady, in this volume.

² If the fragment really dates back to *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου*, the Peripatetic, after discussing the quality and richness of dance figures in Aeschylus’ dramas, also noted that, in the evolution of the tragic genre, they suffered a relentless decline. It is also possible that the fragment comes from a treatise, otherwise not attested, on tragedy and its evolution, a topic to which Chamaeleon’s interests and critical tools would appear relevant (see **40A-D** on satyr plays, **41** on Thespis, **43A-B** on Aeschylus, **46** and **47** on comedy).

COMOEDIA

De Anaxandride

Περὶ κωμωδίας

46 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.16 373f-374b (*BT* vol. 2 p. 317.3-17 Kaibel)

43 W ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ κωμικοῦ τούτου (*scil.* Ἀναξανδρίδου) ἐμνήσθην
καὶ οἶδα τὸ δράμα τὸν Τηρέα αὐτοῦ μὴ κεκριμένον ἐν
374a τοῖς πρώτοις, ἐκθήσομαι ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες φίλοι, εἰς κρίσιν ἃ
εἶρηκε περὶ αὐτοῦ Χαμαιλέων ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης ἐν ἔκτῳ περὶ
κωμωδίας γράφων ὧδε· “Ἀναξανδρίδης διδάσκων ποτὲ 5
διθύραμβον Ἀθήνησιν εἰσῆλθεν ἐφ’ ἵππου καὶ ἀπήγγειλέν
τι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἄσματος. ἦν δὲ τὴν ὄψιν καλὸς καὶ μέγας
καὶ κόμην ἔτρεφε καὶ ἐφόρει ἀλουργίδα καὶ κράσπεδα
374b χρυσᾶ. πικρὸς δ’ ὢν τὸ ἦθος ἐποίει τι τοιοῦτο περὶ
τὰς κωμωδίας· ὅτε γὰρ μὴ νικῶν, λαμβάνων ἔδωκεν εἰς 10
τὸν λιβανωτὸν κατατεμεῖν καὶ οὐ μετεσκεύαζεν ὥσπερ οἱ
πολλοί. καὶ πολλὰ ἔχοντα κομψῶς τῶν δραμάτων ἠφάνιζε,
δυσκολαίνων τοῖς θεαταῖς διὰ τὸ γῆρας. λέγεται δ’ εἶναι
Ῥόδιος ἐκ Καμίρου”.

*Anaxandrides PCG T 2 K.-A. cf. Eust. Iliad. 1273.6-8, vol. 4, p. 628, 16-20
Van der Valk 13-14 cf. Sud.lex. α 1982 Adler s.v. Ἀναξανδρίδης*

14 Καμίρου *Kaibel* : καμήρου *A*

COMEDY

On Anaxandrides

46 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.16 373f-374b

Since I have recalled this comic playwright (Anaxandrides) and know that his play *Tereus*¹ has not been judged among the first, I shall excerpt for your judgment, dear men, what Chamaeleon of Heraclea said about him in the sixth book *On Comedy*,² where he writes as follows: “Once, when Anaxandrides was directing a dithyramb at Athens, he arrived on a horse and related something from the lines of his song. He was good looking, tall, let his hair grow, and wore a purple robe and golden borders. He had a bitter character and composed somewhat in this way with his comedies: whenever he did not win, he took them to the grocer and gave them to him to cut up so that he would not revise them as most (poets) do. He destroyed many cleverly composed plays,³ since he was bad-tempered at the spectators because of his old age. He is said to be Rhodian, from the town of Camiro”.⁴

¹ Athenaeus discusses Anaxandrides, a dithyrambic poet and comic playwright of the 4th cent. BC (both genres were the subject of studies by the Heracleot: about dithyramb see notes on **33** from Περὶ Λάσου; see also Ieranò 1997, p. 315). Athenaeus was compelled to discuss the *Tereus*, a comedy by this poet that found no favor with the public, because it was still available for reading at his time, despite what Chamaeleon says.

² Anaxandrides’ comedy *Tereus* (see PCG fr. 46-48 K.-A.), like those of Cantharus and Philetairus and the tragedy of Sophocles, was on the myth of Tereus, Philomela, and Procne: see Nesselrath, p. 216.

³ Chamaeleon’s treatise *On Comedy* extended for at least six books, as this fragment states, and was most likely dedicated to individual playwrights, including biographical data, probably based on the content of their own works: the case of the aggressiveness of Anaxandrides, which was probably reflected in his plays, and perhaps also in the garment he was wearing at the time he appeared on a horse singing a part of his dithyramb, seems to be the same one of one of his comic characters (see Wehrli², p. 87 and, therein mentioned, Poll. *Onom.* 4.119).

⁴ The information about the home of Anaxandrides at the end of this fragment coincides with *Suda lex. α* 1982 Adler: it is possible that it is also words of Chamaeleon (but we have no fragments for poets in which there is explicit testimony from Chamaeleon indicating their home, unless we want to

De Hegemone

Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας

47 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 9.72 406e-407c (*BT* vol. 2 pp. 386.24-388.6 Kaibel)

- 44 w Χαμαιλέων ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν ἔκτῳ περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας· “Ἠγήμων”, φησὶν, “ὁ Θάσιος ὁ τὰς παρωδίας γράψας Φακῇ ἐπεκαλεῖτο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐν τινι τῶν παρωδιῶν·
ταῦτά μοι ὀρμαίνοντι παρίστατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη,
χρυσὴν ῥάβδον ἔχουσα, καὶ ἥλασεν εἰπέ τε μῦθον· 5
406f δεινὰ παθοῦσα, Φακῇ βδελυρὴ, χώρει’ς τὸν ἀγῶνα.
καὶ τότε’ ἐγὼ θάρσησα.
εἰσῆλθε δέ ποτε καὶ εἰς τὸ θέατρον διδάσκων κωμωδίαν λίθων ἔχων πλήρες τὸ ἱμάτιον, οὓς βάλλων εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν διαπορεῖν ἐποίησε τοὺς θεατάς. καὶ ὀλίγον 10
διαλιπὼν εἶπε·
407a λίθοι μὲν οἶδε· βαλλέτω δ’ εἴ τις θέλει·
ἀγαθὸν δὲ κὰν χειμῶνι κὰν θέρει φακῇ.
εὐδοκίμει δ’ ὁ ἀνὴρ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς παρωδαῖς καὶ περιβόητος ἦν λέγων τὰ ἔπη πανούργως καὶ ὑποκριτικῶς 15
καὶ διὰ ταῦτα σφόδρα παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις εὐδοκίμει.
ἐν δὲ τῇ Γιγαντομαχίᾳ οὕτω σφόδρα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐκήλησεν, ὥς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ πλεῖστα αὐτοὺς γελάσαι, καίτοι ἀγγελθέντων αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τῶν γενομένων περὶ Σικελίαν ἀτυχημάτων. οὐδεὶς ἀπέστη καίτοι σχεδὸν 20
407b πᾶσι τῶν οἰκείων ἀπολωλότων. ἔκλαιον οὖν ἐγκαλυψάμενοι, οὐκ ἀνέστησαν δ’, ἵνα μὴ γένωνται διαφανεῖς τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων θεωροῦσιν ἀχθόμενοι τῇ συμφορᾷ· διέμειναν δ’ ἀκροώμενοι καίτοι καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἠγήμονος, ὥς ἤκουσε, σιωπᾶν διεγνωκός. καθ’ ὃν δὲ χρόνον θαλασσοκρατοῦντες 25
Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνῆγον εἰς ἄστὺ τὰς νησιωτικὰς δίκας γραψάμενός τις καὶ τὸν Ἠγήμονα δίκην ἤγαγεν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας. ὁ δὲ παραγενόμενος καὶ συναγαγὼν τοὺς περὶ
407c τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίτας προσῆλθε μετ’ αὐτῶν Ἀλκιβιάδης

consider as his the beginning of Sappho's biography in **29** and what Tatian says in **15**). On this topic see Schorn², in this volume, p. 438. Scorza, p. 28, assumes that this fragment can be traced to Athenaeus through another source (see below, **47** n. 1).

On Hegemon

47 Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 9.72 406e-407c

Chamaeleon of Pontus in the sixth book *On Old Comedy*¹ says, "Hegemon of Thasos,² the author of parodies, came to be called 'Lentil Soup' (*Phakê*)³ and composed the following in one of the parodies: 'when I was pondering these things Pallas Athena stood next to me holding a golden wand, and she laughed and said, "having suffered terrible things, loathsome Lentil-Soup, go into the contest." And then I got bold.' He once entered the theatre to direct a comedy with many stones in his gown, which he threw into the orchestra to confuse the spectators. After a little he said, 'Here are some stones: throw them if anyone wants to. Lentil soup is good winter and summer.'

The man had an especially good reputation for parodies and was notorious for saying epic mischievously and theatrically and because of this he had a very good reputation among the Athenians. In his *Gigantomachy* he so entertained the Athenians that they laughed at most things that day, even though the misfortunes that had occurred in Sicily⁴ were announced to them in the theatre; no one left even though pretty well everyone had lost family members. They began to weep discreetly, but did not get up to leave, in order that they would not be seen by the spectators from other cities, although they were grieved by the misfortune. They remained listening, however, even though Hegemon himself, when he heard, had decided to be quiet.

At the time when the Athenians were rulers of the sea and brought to the city the lawsuits of the islanders, someone brought a suit also against Hegemon and brought him to trial in Athens. He arrived, gathered the artisans of Dionysus, and went with them to Alcibiades to ask for help. He (Alcibiades) urged them

βοηθεῖν ἀξιῶν. ὁ δὲ θαρρεῖν παρακελευσάμενος εἰπὼν τε 30
 πᾶσιν ἔπεσθαι ἦκεν εἰς τὸ Μητρῶον, ὅπου τῶν δικῶν ἦ-
 σαν αἱ γραφαί, καὶ βρέξας τὸν δάκτυλον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος
 διήλειψε τὴν δίκην τοῦ Ἠγήμονος. ἀγανακτοῦντες δ' ὅ τε
 γραμματεῦς καὶ ὁ ἄρχων ἡσυχίαν ἤγαγον δι' Ἀλκιβιάδην,
 φυγόντος δι' εὐλάβειαν καὶ τοῦ τὴν δίκην γραψαμένου". 35

1-3, 8-13 *Hegemon PCG T4 K.-A.*, vol. 5, p. 546 2 *Arist. Poet.* 3 1448a12 3
Ath. Deipn. 1.5a-b (= *Hegemon PCG T1 K.-A.*, vol. 5, p. 546) δείπνων
 ἀναγραφὰς πεποίηνται ἄλλοι τε ... καὶ Ἠγήμων ὁ Θάσιος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς
 Φακῇ, ὃν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ κωμῳδίᾳ τινὲς ἐντάττουσιν *nec non Ath. Deipn.*
15.698c et Eust. Iliad. 1239.27, vol. 4, p. 512.23-26 *Van der Valk* 4-7 *Hegemon*
vv. 18-21 Brandt 17 *cf. Hegemon p. 38 cum adn. 4 Brandt*

2 ὁ A (*vide Peppink adn. ad loc.*) : *om. Kaibel* 13 ἀγαθὸν δὲ κἂν χειμῶνι
 κἂν θέρει φακῇ *Dobree coll. Sud. lex. s.v. βαίτη* : φακῇ δὲ καὶ ἐν θέρει καὶ
 ἐν χειμῶνι ἀγαθὸν *codd.* 16 διὰ ταῦτα A : διὰ τοῦτο C 20 οὐδεὶς οὖν
 C, *sed epitomatoris culpa haec turbata notavit Kaibel* ἀνέστη *le. fort. recte*
 A 34 ἡσυχίαν ἦγον C

to be bold and told them all to follow him to the Metroön, where the records of the lawsuits were. He wetted his finger in his mouth and erased the lawsuit of Hegemon. The secretary and the magistrate were angry but kept quiet because of Alcibiades, since the man who had filed the suit fled out of respect (for him).”⁵

¹ The title of Chamaeleon’s book from which Athenaeus claims to quote this passage is *Περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας*, which shows an important difference from the one quoted in **46** because it refers to comedy as *ἀρχαία*. On this title Koepke (with a large number of testimonies and examples of similar works written by scholars of the Peripatos contemporary with Chamaeleon as well as philologists of the first generation in Alexandria, see pp. 26-27), Scorza, p. 27, Wehrli², pp. 86-87, Steffen, p. 56, and Giordano², p. 181, converge in the belief that “*Old*” is an inappropriate and incorrect addition of Athenaeus, since the division of comedy into *old*, *middle* and *new* could not be well defined at the time of Chamaeleon; the passage refers to the most generic *Περὶ κωμωδίας* mentioned by Ath., *Deipn.* 9.15 373f. This hypothesis seems further confirmed by the fact that in both cases Athenaeus adds the same book number from which he extracted the information: the sixth (book which, based on only two fragments preserved, would seem to be constituted as a ‘gallery’ of biographies of comic playwrights). Two other passages of Athenaeus might suggest otherwise: *Deipn.* 1.8 5b and 15.56 699a. In the first Athenaeus says that Hegemon is enumerated by ‘some’ among the poets of old comedy, and in the second, talking about Hegemon’s comedy *Philine*, he says that this was composed by him according to the *ἀρχαῖον τρόπον* (the two passages are attributed to Polemon of Ilium by Brandt, p. 39: Polemon is also the source of Athenaeus 15.698c, the longest fragment of Hegemon’s parody quoted also by Chamaeleon: see Brandt, p. 40). Then, or in both cases we must assume a personal intervention of Athenaeus, or, more likely, he had a source (perhaps Polemon) that listed Hegemon among the poets of the *ἀρχαία*. If, as Scorza, p. 28, supposed for **46**, Athenaeus did not quote directly from Chamaeleon, but from a intermediary source, or if Athenaeus had in mind the work of Polemon, from which in other places he got information and quotations on Hegemon, one might suppose that in this case, as in the other two listed above, he unduly extended to the treatise of Chamaeleon a concept that dates back to another (on Polemon and Chamaeleon see Panomitros, p. 149). An opinion somewhat in favor of the title testified by Athenaeus and the possibility that in the Peripatos there was already a distinction among the three periods of comedy is in Nesselrath, p. 164: “Dennoch bieten diese beiden Schriftentitel Chamaileons ein erstes (noch sehr unsicher) Indiz dafür, daß der Peripatos Gedanken zu einer Epocheneinteilung der Kömodie entwickelte.”

² On Hegemon of Thasus, comic poet of Old Comedy and first parodic poet, see *RE* VII.2, s. v. “Hegemon” (3), coll. 2595-96 (A. Körte) and “Hegemon” (1), *DNP* 5, col. 233 (O. Montanari).

FABULA

De fabula Lybica et Cybisso inventore

- 48** Hesychius Alexandrinus, *Lexicon* s.v. Λιβυκοὶ λόγοι (Λ 946, vol. 2 p. 595.32-33 Latte)

Λιβυκοὶ λόγοι· Χαμαιλέων φησὶ Κυβισσὸν τὸν Λίβυν εὐρεῖν τοὺς λόγους τούτους.

cf. Diogenian. De proverb. praef. vol. 1, p. 180, 9-11 Leutsch-Schneidewin Λυβικὸς δὲ αἶνος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους εἰρῆσθαι λέγεται, ἀπὸ Λίβυός τινος. οἱ δὲ Κύβισαν εὐρέτην γενέσθαι τοῦ εἴδους τούτου, ὡς Αἰσχύλος διασαφεῖ· “ὦδ’ ἐστὶ μύθων τῶν Λιβυκῶν τὸ κλέος” (*Aesch. TrGF F 139.1 Radt*) *Theon. Progymnasm.* περὶ μύθου 173, p. 31, 19-20 *Patillon* Κόννις ὁ Κίλιξ, καὶ Θούρος ὁ Συβαρίτης, καὶ Κυβισσὸς ἐκ Λιβύης, μνημονεύονται ὑπὸ τινων ὡς μυθοποιοί *Babr. Fab. 107 – Prol. II 5-6 Luzzatto-La Penna* Αἴσωπος ὁ σοφός, εἶπε καὶ Λιβυστίνοις Κυβίσσης *de fabula Libyca cf. etiam Arist. Rhet. 1393a.30, Quintil. Inst. or. 5.11.20; Himer. or. 66.1 Colonna; Hermog. Progymn. 1.10 Rabe; schol. in Aristoph. Aves 807a cf. et*

³ ‘Lentil Soup’, a nickname that Hegemon gave himself, is also testified in Ath., *Deipn.* 1.8 5b in a passage attributable to Polemon. Here too practice of the so-called ‘method of Chamaeleon’ is explicit: after reporting the genre in which Hegemon distinguished himself, the parody, Chamaeleon refers to the nickname, ‘Lentil Soup’, and confirms this data through two passages of the poet’s work.

⁴ Chamaeleon adds the evidence of Hegemon’s glory as an author by means of a passage in more momentous historical context: the performance of his *Gigantomachy* on the day the defeat in Sicily was announced in Athens (Sept. 10th 413; on the occasion and the place where this was done, the Odeion and not the theatre, see Brandt, pp. 38-39 n. 5).

⁵ The second anecdote referred to Hegemon by Chamaeleon apparently concerns a period between 421 and 415 when Alcibiades was at the height of his influence. Somebody sued Hegemon, who turned to Alcibiades to solve the problem. He intervened with his well-known ease. Giordano², p. 184, tries to demonstrate that Chamaeleon’s historical data have no basis and are probably wrong. But I should better think that some of these mistakes are not attributable to Chamaeleon himself, but to the intermediary source (see above, n. 1), if not to Athenaeus himself. Therefore, the method applied to Hegemon could not confirm the criteria usually attributed to Chamaeleon’s biographical studies and can suggest that he also used, if possible, evidence that was historically better grounded.

FABLES

On Libyan Fables and Cybissus their Inventor

48 Hesychius, *Lexicon*, under *Libykoi logoi*

“Libyan Stories.” Chamaeleon says that Cybissus the Libyan invented these stories.¹

An interest of Peripatetics in tales seems to be attested in Aristotle, Theophrastus, Strato, and Demetrius of Phalerum, who assembled a collection of Aesop’s stories (see Matelli¹, pp. 413-47, esp. 428-31). No fragment from, however, indicates a book solely devoted to investigating this literary genre, although some titles handed down by Diogenes Laertius do more or less explicitly refer to monographs that must have treated it. This short fragment thus assumes a stronger importance, as indicated first by Lorenzoni, who reports that Chamaeleon identified the Libyan Cybissus (for the uncertainties of the tradition of the name see app. crit., Giordano², p. 183 and Lorenzoni², p. 138 n. 5) as πρῶτος εὐρητής of the Libyan fable, in the taste of *prôta heurêmata* well attested in Chamaeleon (see 26, 27, 41, 44).

¹ The same information, despite the uncertainty about the name, recurs in Diogenianus and Helius Theon, who in *Progymnasmata* mentions the genre

284 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

807b *de peripateticis qui de fabulis disseruerunt* cf. *Dem. Phal.* Αἰσωπείων
α' (*Diog. Laert.* 5.82 = *fr.* 1.108 *SOD* = *fr.* 112 *Wehrli*)

1 Κυβισσὸν τὸν Λίβυν *Fabricius, coll. Theon. Progymnasm. et Babr. Fab.*
(cf. *app. loc. par.*) : Κυβυντον *H* 1-2 Χαμαιλέων – εὐρεῖν *Musurus* :
Χαμελαιων – υρει *H*

ORATORES

Hyperides et Lysurgus Platonis auditores

49 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 3.46 (*BT* vol. 1, p. 221.9-11 *Marcovich*)

45 W ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ Θεόφραστον ἀκοῦσαί φασιν αὐτοῦ (*scil.* Πλάτωνος). καὶ Ὑπερίδην τὸν ῥήτορα Χαμαιλέων φησὶ καὶ Λυκοῦργον· ὁμοίως Πολέμων ἱστορεῖ.

1 cf. *app. ad Thphr. fr.* 1.4-5 *FHS&G* 2 cf. [*Plut.*] *Vit. dec. orat.* 848d
nec non Sud.lex. v 294 *Adler, s.v.* Ὑπερίδης 3 cf. [*Plut.*] *Vit. dec. orat.*
841b *Polemon FHG fr.* 9, vol. 3 p. 117 = *fr.* VIII *Preller*

2 ὑπερήδην *B* χαμελέων *B*

and its inventor in a general overview of various kinds of stories. Note that in the *De utilitate mathematicae* of Theon of Smyrna, in a list of the meanings of the word λόγος in the Peripatos, ‘tale’ appears, with explicit reference to the Libyan (72.24 Hiller ὁ Λιβυκὸς καὶ ὁ μῦθος καὶ ὁ αἶνος λόγος λέγεται). The source of this information in Hesychius (but also in Helius Theon, Theon of Smyrna and Diogenianus) is certainly Peripatetic and I should be tempted to think expressly to Chamaeleon, although it is impossible to define in which work he may have given these insights. If the passage of Diogenianus actually derives from Chamaeleon, the mention of Aeschylus may support its derivation from the Περὶ Αἰσχύλου, though elsewhere Chamaeleon uses quotations from authors to support his claims (see 37, where he quotes Stesichorus in relation with Simonides).

ORATORS

Hyperides and Lycurgus Pupils of Plato

49 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 3.46

Some say that Theophrastus also heard him (Plato). Chamaeleon¹ says that Hyperides the orator and Lycurgus (also did). Polemon² gives a similar report.

¹ The text is from Diogenes Laertius’ biography of Plato, in a list of Plato’s pupils that is drawn from many sources. The occurrence of the same information in Ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. or.* 848b, in an obviously biographical context, without any indication of source (see Koepke, p. 48, Scorza, p. 44, Steffen, p. 58 and Giordano², p. 186), and the presence of a similar story, although referring to Demosthenes, in Plut., *Dem.* 5, who quotes Hermippus as a source (*FGrHistcont.* F 49a Bollansée: Ἑρμιππος δέ φησιν ἀδεσπότοις ὑπομνήμασιν ἐντυχεῖν, ἐν οἷς ἐγέγραπτο τὸν Δημοσθένη συνεσχολακέναι Πλάτῳ), may allow us to posit a biographical work dedicated to orators or to Plato.

² On Polemon of Ilium, geographer and historian of the 3rd-2nd century BC, see *RE* XXI.2, s.v. “Polemon” (9), coll. 1288-1320 (K. Deichgräber) and *DNP* 10, s.v. “Polemon” (2), col. 7 (I. von Bredow). This fragment seems to come from his Ἀναγραφὴ τῶν ἐπωνύμων τῶν δήμων καὶ φυλῶν in the section on Attica of his *Periêgêsis kosmikê*: see Preller, p. 43 and *RE* XXI.2, coll. 1295-96.

III. INCERTA

ANACREON

De Artemone (?)

[50] *POxy.* LIV 3722, s. II p. Chr., fr. 73, 3-4 Maehler (p. 44 Maehler)

 γῆυναιξιν .[
4 ἴσα Χαμα[ιλέων
cf. **39**

3 γυναιξιν *Mähler adn. ad lineam 3, fr. 82.12 Gentili revocans* 4 Χαμα[ιλέων
temptavi, vide dissertatiunculam meam in Aegyptus 88 (2008), pp. 30-31 cum
adn. 17 post l. 4 spatio unius lineae vacuo relicto plura leguntur: l. 8 ἐν Τέῳ
δ' ἄθλα tempt. Mähler adn. ad loc.; l. 9 ἐν Τέῳ οἰκησάντων tempt. Mähler
adn. ad loc.; l. 10 plane legitur περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος

SIMONIDES

De Simonidis avaritia

[51] *Schol. vet. Tr. in Aristoph. Pacem* 697e (p. 108.7-8 Holwerda)

 τοῦ ἱαμβοποιοῦ καὶ <Χαμαιλέων> μέμνηται, ὅτι σμικρολόγος
ἦν· ὅθεν Ξενοφάνης κίμβικα αὐτὸν προσαγορεύει.
Simonides T74d Poltera cf. **36** 2 *Xenophanes 21 B 21 D.-K., vol. 1, p. 134*

1 τοῦ ἱαμβοποιοῦ *V: ἱαμβοποιουῶς ΓLh (ἱαμ- bis Γ) post ἱαμβοποιουῶς*
697c Lh post καὶ lacunam statuit Holwerda, nomen scriptoris cuiusdam

III. UNCERTAIN

ANACREON

On Artemon (?)

[50] Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 54 3722 fr. 73.3-4

. . . to women¹ Chama[eleon²

¹ Line 3 of the papyrus reports the only word that the editor can integrate with some confidence (γ]υναιξίν), quoting in the commentary v. 12 of Anacreon fr. 82 Gentili, the well-known passage on Eurypyle and Artemon (see 39), which comes from Chamaeleon's Περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος.

² In line 4 traces of six letters are decipherable, the first of which is very abraded; five are read with some doubt by the publisher (σαχαμ), while remains of the last, in the extreme right corner of the papyrus, offer only a tiny trace, which appears compatible with the lower portion of the left curved section of a very italic alpha (see Martano, p. 30 n. 17). If line 3 could refer to fr. 82 Gentili (see 39), one might see the beginning of the name of the Peripatetic: Χαμα[ιλέων or Χαμα[ιλέοντος. What remains of the earlier letters is difficult to integrate (*exempli gratia* one could think of an expression such as ὁ]σα Χαμα[ιλέων φησί/ιστορεῖ). In partial support of this hypothesis, περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος can be clearly read in line 10 of the same fragment, and such a title is known for a work of Chamaeleon (see 39), but we cannot be sure that the context of the line refers to a book and not to Anacreon in general. Note that lines 6-13 seem to refer to a different lemma, since line 5 of the papyrus was left empty, indicating a change of subject (see West, pp. 1-2).

SIMONIDES

On Simonides' Avarice

[51] Scholium on Aristophanes' *Peace* 697e

of the writer of iambi. And <Chamaeleon> records that he (Simonides) was a money grabber. For Xenophanes calls him *kimbix*.¹

¹ The integration of the name of Chamaeleon in the lacuna stated by Holwerda in the text of this scholium and the consequent attribution of this fragment to the philosopher of Heraclea Pontica was proposed during the conference held in Rome by Ettore Cingano, whose paper, unfortunately, is not in this volume. The

excidisse suspicans, Χαμαιλέων *coni. Cingano* (*vd. adn. 1*) 2 σμικρολόγος
V: -οι Γ κίμβικα VT: κομ- Lh αὐτὸν V: αὐτὰ Γ

IV. LOCI NONNULLI AD CHAMAELEONTEM
DUBITANTER TRIBUTI

SAPIENTIA

De proverbio

[52] Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.14.61.1-2 (vol. 1 p. 39.1-6
Stählin) : trib. Lorenzoni², p. 143

τὸ δ' "ἐγγύα, πάρα δ' ἄτα" Κλεομένης μὲν ἐν τῷ περὶ
Ἡσιόδου Ὀμήρου φησὶ προειρῆσθαι διὰ τούτων·
δειλαί τοι δειλῶν γε καὶ ἐγγύαι ἐγγυάασθαι·
οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλη Χίλωνος αὐτὸ νομίζουσι, Δίδυμος
δὲ Θαλοῦ φησιν εἶναι τὴν παραίνεσιν.

5

cf. **3A-B** 1-2 *Hesiod. T 149 Most = 116 Jacoby* 3 *Hom. Od. θ 351* 4 *Arist.*
*fr. 4 Rose*³ 5 *Didym. fr. 4, pp. 372-74 Schmidt*

1 ἐγγυᾶι L 3 γε Stählin coll. Hom.: τε L

tradition of Simonides as a money grabber (in Chamaeleon as well as in the *bios* of the *Suda*) and the significative association of the name of the poet with the epithet *kimbix*, attested in the passage ascribed to Chamaeleon by Athenaeus (see **36**), validate the proposal of Cingano. In this case, the scholium can also offer new data on the source of Chamaeleon: he found his information in the *Sylloi* of Xenophanes, who used *kimbix* as an epithet for Simonides (the epithet *kimbix* is used only for Simonides and for Archestratus of Gela in Ath., *Deipn.* 7.67 303e).

IV. SOME PASSAGES ATTRIBUTED WITH DOUBT TO CHAMAELEON

WISDOM

A Saying

[52] Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork*, 1.14.61.1-2

Cleomenes¹ in the work *On Hesiod* says the saying, ‘a guarantee, and next to it ruin,’ was said before by Homer in these words: ‘pledges pledged by the worthless are also worthless to you.’ Those associated with Aristotle think it was Chilon’s saying, but Didymus² says the advice was Thales’.³

Lorenzoni, p. 143: “L’apoftegma di cui stiamo parlando (*scil.* ἐγγύα, πέρα δ’ ἄτα) era dagli aristotelici attribuito a Chilone, come informa Clem. Al. *Strom.* I 14 (p. 39, 1-5 Stählin) τὸ δ’ ἐγγύα – νομίζουσι: non è improbabile che qui sia da vedere un riferimento al nostro Cameleonte.”

¹ This Cleomenes, adduced by Clement as source, is not identified.

² On Didymus see **3A**.

³ In Clement of Alexandria the saying ‘a guarantee, and next to it ruin,’ is attributed to Chilon, according to an opinion referring to the circle of Aristotle. In **3A** it appears with ‘know thyself’, but, unfortunately, the papyrus is mutilated and does not include either the attribution or its source; the name Chamaeleon recurs in line 31 in connection with the attribution of the saying ‘know thyself’ to Thales. In fact no data allow us to assert that Chamaeleon attributed this saying to Chilon, and the expression οἱ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλη may well refer to other Peripatetics interested in paroemiography.

ETHICA

De Smindyridis voluptate

[53] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 12.3 511c-d (*BT* vol. 3 pp. 128.27-129.11 Kaibel) : trib. Koepke, pp. 46-47

Οὐδεὶς δὲ λέγει τὸν Ἀριστείδου βίον ἡδύν, ἀλλὰ τὸν
Σμινδυρίδου τοῦ Συβαρίτου καὶ τὸν Σαρδαναπάλλου (καίτοι
κατὰ τὴν δόξαν, φησὶν ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡδονῆς Θεόφραστος, οὐχ
ὁμοίως λαμπρὸς ἐστίν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐτρέφησεν ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι),
οὐδὲ τὸν Ἀγησιλάου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλέως, ἀλλὰ 5
μᾶλλον, εἰ ἔτυχεν, τὸν Ἀνάγιος οὕτως ἀοράτου κατὰ δόξαν
ὄντος, οὐδὲ τὸν τῶν ἡμιθέων τῶν ἐπὶ Τροίας, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ
511d μᾶλλον τὸν νῦν. καὶ τοῦτ' εἰκότως. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀκατάσκευος
καὶ καθάπερ ἀνεύρετος ἦν, οὐτ' ἐπιμιξίας οὔσης οὔτε τῶν
τεχνῶν διηκριβωμένων, ὁ δὲ πᾶσιν ἐξηρτυμένος πρὸς ῥα- 10
στῶν καὶ πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας διαγωγὰς.

cf. 9 *Thphr. fr. 551 FHS&G = L111 Fortenbaugh* 6 *Ananius cf. IEG p. 36*
West

6 κατὰ τὴν δόξαν *E* 8 τὸν νῦν *Kaibel* : τῶν νῦν *A*, <τὸν> τῶν νῦν
Meineke

ETHICS

On Smindyrides' Pleasure

[53] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 12.3 511c-d

“No one calls the life of Aristides pleasant, but those of Smindyrides of Sybaris and Sardanapallus. And yet as far as his reputation goes,” says Theophrastus in his *On Pleasure*, “Aristides is incomparably brilliant; but he did not engage in the sort of luxury they did. Nor was the life of King Agesilaus of Sparta pleasant, but perhaps that of Ananius, obscure though his reputation was; nor was the life of the demigods at Troy pleasant, but that today is much more so. And this is reasonable. Life in heroic times lacked comforts, as it were, and nothing had been invented then, since there had been no commerce, and no crafts had been refined, whereas life today is fitted out with everything for ease, enjoyment, and other pastimes.¹

Koepke, p. 46: “Tria enim tantummodo fragmenta libri Περὶ ἡδονῆς supersunt, si quidem quod habet Athen. XII. p. 511.c.d. φησὶν ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἡδονῆς Θεόφραστος ad Chamaeleontem referendum est. Sed ea de re non dubitandum erit, quia et argumentum loci Chamaeleontis libro aptum videtur neque ullus Theophrasti liber de voluptate hominibus litteratis cognitus est. Athenaeus igitur si erravit ideo errasse videtur, quia narratiunculam illam de Smindyride non ex genuino sed ex derivato quodam fonte hausit.”

Koepke, pp. 46-47: “Chamaeleontem luxuriosam Sybaritae vitam comparasse videtur cum simplici Aristidis. Utriusque vita variam attulit voluptatem, Smindyridae corporis, Aristidi vero sinceram et infucatam, quam ex recta conscientia sui factorumque suorum ceperat. Merito igitur Chamaeleontem integram voluptatem non quaesivisse credendum est in iis, quae sensibus placerent, sed in iis, quae cum honestate consentirent. Itaque Athen. XII. p. 511.c.d. narrat: Οὐδεὶς – διαγωγάς.”

¹ Koepke assigns to Chamaeleon's Περὶ ἡδονῆς all the fragments cited by Athenaeus with the name of Chamaeleon and Theophrastus (8-9), and this passage also, which is attributed in the *Deipnosophists* only to Theophrastus. It is evident that the double attribution of 8 and 9 (see 8 n. 3), and the recurrence in this passage of Smindyrides (but Sardanapallus is also here!) as a yardstick for Agesilaus, would facilitate attribution to Chamaeleon rather than Theophrastus. But Koepke claims mistakenly that no book of Theophrastus on this subject is known, since more than one title connected with this theme recurs in the list of books of Theophrastus (see fr. 436.26-28 FHS&G) and many passages

Alcaeus sive de bibendo vinum

- [54] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 1.41 22e-f (*BT* vol. 1 p. 50.12-18 Kaibel) : trib. Andò, pp. 249-250

καὶ Μνησίθεος δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Διόνυσον ἰατρόν φησι
τὴν Πυθίαν χρῆσαι τιμᾶν Ἀθηναίοις. φησὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀλκαῖος
ὁ Μιτυληναῖος ποιητής·

22f Τέγγε πλεύμονας οἴνω, τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται,
ἅ δ' ὥρα χαλέπα· πάντα δὲ δίψαισ' ὑπὰ καύματος 5
καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ·

Πώνωμεν, τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται.

cf. 12 1-2 *Mnesitheus* fr. 42 Bertier, cf. etiam fr. 41 (ex *Ath. Deipn.* 2.36a) 4-5
Alcaeus fr. 347.1-2 Voigt 7 *Alcaeus* fr. 352 Voigt, sed cf. etiam fr. 346.1 Voigt

1 δ' ὁ *K*: δὲ *CE* ἰατρός *C* 4 τέγγε πλεύμονας οἴνω *Kaibel e codd. AC*
Ath. Deipn. 10.430 et alii : οἴνω πνεύμονα τέγγε *CE ad loc.* πνεύμονας
cod. A Procl. in Hes. Op. 584, πνεύμονα alii 5 πάντα – καύματος *om.*
E δὲ δίψαισ' *Seidler ad Ath. Deipn.* 10.430b : δ' ἐδίψουν *C* 7 πώνωμεν
corr. Meineke vol. 4, p. 194 adn. ad Ath. Deipn. 10.430d πίνωμεν· τὶ τὰ
λύχνα ὁμμένομεν/ δάκτυλος ἄμέρα *Brunck, qui Athenaeum* fr. 346.1 cum
347.1 Voigt male permiscuisse suspicatus est

De Locrensibus capite damnatis si vinum purum
bibissent nisi a medico iussi

- [55] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.33 429a (*BT* vol. 2 p. 433.4-8 Kaibel) : dub. trib. Koepke, p. 40 and Scorza, p. 37

παρὰ δὲ Λοκροῖς τοῖς Ἐπιζεφυρίοις, εἴ τις ἄκρατον
ἔπιε μὴ προστάξαντος ἰατροῦ θεραπείας ἔνεκα, θάνατος

attributed to the philosopher of Eresus deal with issues very close to pleasure (see frs. 549-556 FHS&G). There is no reason not to believe that this fragment is Theophrastean and that both Chamaeleon and Theophrastus used similar examples.

Alcaeus or about Drinking Wine

[54] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 1.41 22e-f

Mnesitheus of Athens also says that in an oracle the Pythia ordered the Athenians to honor Dionysus as a physician. And Alcaeus the poet from Mitylene says: “Moisten your lungs with wine. For the star is rising and the season will be harsh, and everything parched by the heat.”¹ And elsewhere: “Let us drink, for the star is coming around.”

Andò, pp. 249-50: “Dal modo in cui il passo si articola ritengo legittimo far risalire la citazione alcaica proprio al peripatetico Cameleonte che nel Περὶ μέθης, dopo aver fatto menzione dell’oracolo della Pizia [12], potrebbe avere inserito la citazione dei due versi di Alceo, che, per il loro contenuto, possono considerarsi l’esemplificazione poetica del responso oracolare.” See also p. 253.

¹ The attribution of this passage to Chamaeleon is based on analogy with the theme preceding it in Athenaeus, who recalls the Pythian oracle that ordered drinking wine, almost like a drug, the twenty days before and after the hottest time of the year between July and August (see 12). The fragment of Alcaeus seems to confirm the oracle, inviting drinking since the ἄστρον, Sirius, rises. There is no more evidence for the attribution than this proximity and the fact that Chamaeleon used Alcaeus as an example in drinking wine (see 13). It is true that his passage doesn’t show a better knowledge of Alcaeus’ poems than 13.

On the Inhabitants of Locri Sentenced to Death if They Drank Pure Wine without Medical Prescription

[55] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.33 429a

In Epizypherian Locris, if someone drank unmixed wine without a doctor’s order, the penalty was death, the law having

ἦν ἡ ζημία, Ζαλεύκου τὸν νόμον θέντος.

cf. 14

De argenteo poculo quod puteus vocabatur

- [56] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 5.18 192a (*BT* vol. 1 pp. 426.28-427.5 Kaibel) : trib. Kaibel, p. 427 et Lorenzoni² p. 144

Σωκράτης [...] ἐγρήγορε μετ' Ἀγάθωνος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ πίνει ἐξ ἀργυροῦ φρέατος – καλῶς γάρ τις τὰ μεγάλα ποτήρια οὕτως ὠνόμασε–.

cf. 10 1-2 *Plat. Sym.* 223c Ἀγάθωνα δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη καὶ Σωκράτη ἔτι μόνους ἐγρηγορέναι καὶ πίνειν ἐκ φιάλης μεγάλης

been proposed by Zaleucus.¹

Koepke, p. 40: “Credibile igitur est, Chamaeleontem laudasse Zaleucum ob illam legem Locrensibus datam, eumque leges a Minerva accepisse, per eam opportunitatem docuisse.”

Scorza, p. 37: “È quasi certo che, pertanto, Cameleonte, data notizia nel suo libro [*scil.* Περὶ μέθης] di codesta legge di Zaleuco, osservasse che dell’opportunità di essa non era da dubitare, visto che era stata promulgata per diretta ispirazione di Atena. E il rapporto del passo di Clemente Alessandrino [14] con quello di Ateneo fa sorgere il sospetto che, probabilmente, Ateneo attingesse appunto al περὶ μέθης di Cameleonte, come, per sua esplicita dichiarazione, attinse da Teofrasto la notizia data subito dopo che a Mileto sussisteva una legge simile a quella di Locri.”

¹ Koepke (p. 40) and Scorza (p. 37) suspect with some justification that, since the passage comes from a section of Athenaeus’ work for which Chamaeleon is sometimes explicitly the source (43A) and sometimes not (53), he may also be the source here. It is also conceivable, however, that other members of Peripatetic school, such as Theophrastus, used such information in other treatises on the subject.

On the Silver Bowl Which Was Called ‘Well’

[56] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 5.18 192a

Socrates stays awake along with Aristophanes and Agathon and drinks from a silver well – for someone aptly applies this term to large drinking cups.¹

Kaibel, p. 427: “(Chamael. XI 461c)” after καλῶς γάρ τις.

Lorenzoni², p. 144: “Nel commentare infine l’asserzione di Cameleonte καὶ μοι δοκοῦσι λέγειν οὐ κακῶς οἱ φάσκοντες τὸ μέγα ποτήριον φρέαρ ἀργυροῦν εἶναι (461c) [10] il G. [*scil.* Giordano¹] scrive che “pozzo d’argento” è “espressione scherzosa che ricorre anche in Ateneo” (p. 112). Quest’ultimo, per la verità la mutua da altri, forse proprio dal nostro Cameleonte: πίνει ἐξ ἀργυροῦ φρέατος – καλῶς γάρ τις τὰ μεγάλα ποτήρια οὕτως ὠνόμασε – (192a).”

¹ The attribution of this fragment is based on the occurrence of ἀργυροῦν φρέαρ used to define large cups for drinking wine. And in fact the wording τις ... ὠνόμασε seems to repeat the οἱ φάσκοντες of 11.4 461c and introduce, under the same generic intonation, a note of Athenaeus, who quotes what he knows thanks to Chamaeleon.

De poetis dum scribebant ebris

- [57] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.33 429a (*BT* vol. 2 pp. 432.28-433.4 Kaibel) : trib. Steffen, p. 55

ἀγνοοῦσί τε οἱ λέγοντες πρῶτον Ἐπίχαρμον ἐπὶ τὴν
σκηνὴν παραγαγεῖν μεθύοντα, μεθ' ὃν Κράτητα ἐν Γείτοσι.
καὶ Ἀλκαῖος δὲ ὁ μελοποιὸς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμω-
δοποιὸς μεθύοντες ἔγραφον τὰ ποιήματα, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ
ἄλλοι μεθυσκόμενοι λαμπρότερον ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ἡγωνίσαντο. 5

cf. 43A 1 locum hunc in Epicharmi testimoniis a Kassel et Austin collectis
non inveni 2 cf. PCG Crates p. 85 K.-A. nec non PCG Crates T2a K.-A. 3
locum hunc in Alcaeii testimoniis a Voigt collectis non inveni Aristophanes T
55 K.-A., vol. 3.2, p. 18, ubi Schol. vet. et Tricl. ad Arist. Equ. 92 adducuntur

1 ἀγνοοῦσι δὲ C 4 δὲ K : τε AC

POETAE

De poetis amore captis

- [58] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.72-76 600d-601c (*BT* vol. 3 pp. 323.21-326.2 Kaibel) : trib. Wilamowitz¹, p. 108 adn. 2; vide etiam Gentili, p. 135 adn. 128

ὃν ὁ σοφὸς ὕμνων αἰεὶ ποτε Ἀνακρέων πᾶσιν ἐστὶν διὰ
στόματος. λέγει οὖν περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ κράτιστος Κριτίας
τάδε·

τὸν δὲ γυναικείων μελέων πλέξαντα πότ' ὥδ' αὖ
ἡδὺν Ἀνακρεΐοντα Τέως εἰς Ἑλλάδ' ἀνῆγεν,
συμποσίων ἐρέθισμα, γυναικῶν ἡπερόπευμα,
αὐλῶν ἀντίπαλον, φιλοβάρβιτον, ἡδύν, ἄλυπον.
οὐ ποτέ σου φιλότης γηράσεται οὐδὲ θανεῖται,

600e

5

On Poets Who Wrote Poems Being Drunk

[57] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 10.33 429a

Those who claim that Epicharmus (and then Crates in *Neighbors*) was the first to bring a drunk on stage, are similarly ill-informed. The lyric poet Alcaeus and the comic poet Aristophanes also produced their poetry while drunk, and many other men fought more brilliantly in war when drunk.¹

Steffen, p. 55: “Nisi egregie fallor, Chamaeleonti etiam ea tribuenda sunt, quae narrationi de Aeschylo subiungit: ἀγνοοῦσι – ἠγωνίσαντο.”

¹ Steffen attributes this passage to Chamaeleon for two reasons: first, the propinquity and second, the similarity of content with his fr. 39 (**43A** of this edition). And in fact **43A** (Ath., *Deipn.* 10.33 428f-429a) is dedicated to making clear that Aeschylus was the first to bring drunk characters on stage (against those who show Euripides as an initiator of this practice) and that Aeschylus often composed his tragedies while drunk. This passage continues the same line: first of all he criticizes οἱ λέγοντες that Epicharmus was the first to do so (apparently returning to the issue of ἐνιοί φασιν of 428f), and then continues by adding that there were other poets who wrote in a state of drunkenness, citing Alcaeus (but see **13**, where Athenaeus asserts that Chamaeleon was not aware of Alcaeus’ propensity for wine) and Aristophanes (whom Chamaeleon does not mention, but it is not unlikely that he did research on Aristophanes and wine).

POETS

On Poets Caught by Love

[58] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 13.72-76 600d-601c

He of whom wise Anacreon is forever singing (Eros) is on the lips of all. So even the great Critias says the following: “Teos once led to Greece sweet Anacreon to weave the songs of women’s melodies, spark of drinking-parties, deceiver of women, competition for flutes, lyre-lover, sweet, painless. Affection for you will never grow old or die, so long as a boy

- ἔς τ' ἂν ὕδωρ οἴνω συμμιγνύμενον κυλίκεσσι
 παῖς διαπομπεύη, προπόσεις ἐπιδέξια νωμῶν, 10
 παννυχίδας θ' ἱερὰς θήλεις χοροὶ ἀμφιέπωσιν,
 πλάστιγξ θ' ἢ χαλκοῦ θυγάτηρ ἐπ' ἄκραισι καθίζη
 κοπτάβου ὑψηλαῖς κορυφαῖς Βρομίου ψακάδεσσιν.
- 600f Ἀρχύτας δ' ὁ ἀρμονικός, ὥς φησι Χαμαιλέων, Ἀλκμᾶνα
 γεγονέναι τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν ἡγεμόνα καὶ ἐκδοῦναι 15
 πρῶτον μέλος ἀκόλαστον, ὄντα καὶ περὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ
 τὴν τοιαύτην μοῦσαν εἰς τὰς διατριβάς. διὸ καὶ λέγειν ἔν
 τινι τῶν μελῶν·
- Ἔρως με δηῦτε Κύπριδος Φέκατι
 γλυκὺς κατεΐβων καρδίαν ἰαίνει 20
 λέγει δὲ καὶ ὡς τῆς Μεγαλοστράτης οὐ μετρίως ἐρασθεῖς,
 601a ποιητρίας μὲν οὔσης, δυναμένης δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν ὁμιλίαν
 τοὺς ἐραστὰς προσελκύσασθαι. λέγει δὲ οὕτως περὶ αὐτῆς·
 τοῦτο Φαδειᾶν ἔδειξε Μωσᾶν
 δῶρον μάκαιρα παρσένων 25
 ἃ ξανθὰ Μεγαλοστράτα
 καὶ Στησίχορος δ' οὐ μετρίως ἐρωτικὸς γενόμενος
 συνέστησε καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῶν ᾄσμάτων, ἃ δὴ
 καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλεῖτο παιδεία καὶ παιδικά. οὕτω
 δ' ἐναγώνιος ἦν ἢ περὶ τὰ ἐρωτικὰ πραγματεία, καὶ οὐδεὶς 30
 ἡγεῖτο φορτικούς τοὺς ἐρωτικούς, ὥστε καὶ Αἰσχύλος
 μέγας ὢν ποιητῆς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἦγον εἰς τὰ θέατρα διὰ
 601b τῶν τραγωδιῶν τοὺς ἔρωτας, ὃ μὲν τὸν Ἀχιλλέως πρὸς
 Πάτροκλον, ὃ δ' ἐν τῇ Νιόβῃ τὸν τῶν παίδων· διὸ καὶ
 παιδεράστριάν τινες καλοῦσι τὴν τραγωδίαν· καὶ ἐδέχοντο 35
 τὰ τοιαῦτα ᾄσματα οἱ θεαταί. καὶ ὁ Ῥηγῖνος δὲ Ἰβυκος
 βοᾷ καὶ κέκραγεν·
 ἦρι μὲν αἶ τε Κυδώνιαι
 μηλίδες ἀρδόμεναι ῥοὰν
 ἐκ ποταμῶν, ἵνα παρθένων 40
 κῆπος ἀκήρατος, αἶ τ' οἴνανθίδες
 αὐξόμεναι σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ' ἔρνεσιν
 οἶναρέοις θαλέθοισιν· ἐμοὶ δ' ἔρος
 οὐδεμίαν κατάκητος ὥραν, ἅθ' ὑπὸ στεροπᾶς φλέγων

delivers water mixed with wine for the cups, dispensing toasts from left to right, and female troops attend night-long rites, and the target disk, daughter of bronze, sits upon the high peaks of the cottabos for the drops of Bromius.”¹

Archytas the harmonist, as Chamaeleon says, claimed that Alcman was the leader of erotic songs and was the first to publish an uncensored song, being prone towards pursuits of women and that sort of muse. For he says in one of his songs, “Once again Eros, for Cypris’ sake, flows sweet over my heart and melts it.” He says too, that Alcman fell immoderately in love with Megalostrate, who was both a poet and able to attract lovers to her by conversation. He speaks thus of her: “Golden-haired Megalostrate, happy maiden, demonstrated this gift of the sweet Muses.”²

Stesichorus also became thoroughly erotic and composed that type of songs; in the past they were called *paideia* and *paidika*.³ Erotic activity became so current – and no one regarded lovers as vulgar – that even Aeschylus, who was a great poet, and Sophocles, introduced love affairs into the theatre through their tragedies, the first, that of Achilles and Patroclus, the second, that of the boys in the *Niobe*: so some even call the tragedy *Paederastris*; and the audience accepted such songs.⁴

And Ibycus of Rhegium, also, cries out and shouts aloud; “In spring grow the quinces, watered by streams in the inviolate garden of the Maidens, and the swelling grape-blossoms thrive beneath the shade of the vine-shoots; but for me love lies quiet in no season; all aflame, like Thracian Boreas amid the lightning-

601c Θρηίκιος βορέας, αίσσων παρὰ Κύπριδος ἀζαλέαις 45
μανίαισιν ἐρεμνὸς

ἀθαμβῆς ἐγκρατέως
παιδόθεν φυλάσσει
ἡμετέρας φρένας.
καὶ Πίνδαρος δ' οὐ μετρίως ὦν ἐρωτικός φησιν· 50
εἴη καὶ ἐρᾶν καὶ ἔρωτι χαρίζεσθαι κατὰ καιρόν·
μὴ πρεσβυτέραν ἀριθμοῦ δίωκε, θυμέ, πρᾶξιν.

cf. **27-28** 4-13 *Kritias* 88 *D1 D.-K.* 14-26 *vide fr. 27* 27-29 *Stesich. TB23(i)(a) Davies, vol. 1, p. 149 = PMG fr. 276 (a) Page* 31 cf. *Aesch. TrGF F 135 Radt (app. – Myrmidones)* 32 cf. *Soph. TrGF F 448 Radt (app. – Niobes)* 38-49 *Ibyc. fr. 286 Davies, vol. 1 p. 284* 51-52 *Pind. fr. 127 Snell-Mähler*

4 τὸν σὲ *Meineke* 8 οὐ ποτε τοῦ *Hermann* γεράσκειται *E* 10 προπόσεις *Mus.* : πρόποσις *AE* ἐπιδέξιν ὤμων *A* 12 πλάστιξ *A* δ' ἡ *E* καθίζη
ς : καθίζει *A*, καθίζει *E* 13 *fort.* ὑψηλοῦ (ὑψηλὴ *Wilamowitz*) κορυφαῖς,
Βρομίου ψακάδεσσιν | <βαλλομένη> *Kaibel* 14-26 *vd. app. crit. ad 27* 24-
26 *om. Epitom.* 29 παῖδεια *Welcker* : παιδιὰ *AE* 35 παιδεράστριάν
Schweighäuser : παιδεραστάν *A* 36 ἄσμενοι οἱ *Kaibel* 39 ῥοᾶν *Musurus*,
fort. recte, si deinceps scripseris Ἑσπερίδων ἵνα παρθένων *secundum*
Kaibel 41 οἶνανθίδες *Musurus, sed numeri non integri* : οἶνανθίδος *A* 44
κατάκοιτος *Musurus, fortasse* κατάκηλος *Kaibel* ἄθ' *Hermann* : τε *A* 45
Θρηίκιος *Fiorillo* : θρηίκος *A* 47 ἀθαμβῆς ἐγκρατέως *Hermann, sed*
nec numeri nec verba integri, fort. <οὔποτ'> ἀθαμβείας ἐγκρατέως *Kaibel*
: ἀθάμβησεν κραταιῶς *A* 48 παιδόθεν *Musurus* : παιδ' ὅθεν *A* 49
ἡμετέρας φρένας *prima antistrophī verba esse vidit Hermann* 51 καὶ κατὰ
καιρόν *A* 51-52 “*verba vix integra*” *Kaibel*

flash, he from my boyhood darted love upon me from Cypris, darkling, unflinching, with scorching madness, and kept my heart under powerful guard.” Pindar too was thoroughly erotic and says: “May it be mine to love and to yield to love in due season. Pursue not, my heart, activity older than your years.”⁵

Wilamowitz¹, p. 108 n. 2: “Athenaeus 599 citiert sein [*scil.* Chamaileons] Buch περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος nur für die Fabel von Anakreons Verbindung mit Sappho, und widerlegt sie schlagend durch die Beobachtung, daß der von Chamaileon citirte Beleg in den Werken Anakreons nicht ihm gehört. Dann bringt er Tragikercitate aus einem Florilegium (z. T. stehen sie bei Stobaeus auch): wenn dann das rare Stück aus Kritias folgt und unmittelbar danach ein Stück Chamaileon über die Erotik der alten Dichter, so kann kein Zweifel sein, daß die alles bis 601c aus Chamaileon stammt. Auch daß Athenaeus ihn selbst gehabt hat, soll man nicht bezweifeln.”

Gentili, p. 135, n. 128: “Dei due frammenti [*scil.* fr. 286 e 287 P. di Ibico] il primo apparteneva sicuramente a carmi designati col nome di *paídeia* o *paidikà*, un genere poetico coltivato pure da Stesicoro, come assicura Cameleonte (fr. 25 Wehrli [= **27**]), che cita fra gli altri il fr. 286 P. di Ibico e l’encomio a Teosseno di Pindaro (fr. 123 Sn.-Maehl.).”

Wilamowitz attributed this fragment to Chamaeleon. It occurs in a long passage that Athenaeus puts on the lips of the grammarian Myrtilus, one of the speakers at the banquet. He claims to be submitting to the other guests a list, which he assembled, of examples of poets-lovers (see *Ath., Deipn.* 13.72 599e). More or less extensive quotations in this list refer to nine poets: 1) Diphilus (from his comedy called *Sappho*); 2) Aeschylus of Alexandria (from his tragedy *Amphitryon* – but the quotation, in this case, does not serve his demonstration, but asserts the personal position of the interlocutor); 3) Euripides (from an uncertain tragedy); 4) Aeschylus (from the *Danaides* and an uncertain tragedy); 5) Critias (for a review of Anacreon); Alcman (quotation explicitly extracted from Chamaeleon, see **27**); 6) Stesichorus (generic citation of his pederastic poems); 7) again Aeschylus (*Myrmidons* and *Niobe*) associated with Sophocles; 8) Ibicus; 9) Pindar. The first four cases, while ranging between fr. **28** of this edition and the fragment in question here, cannot be derived from Chamaeleon. The comic poet Diphilus, in fact, is contemporary with Chamaeleon, and it seems unlikely that he could cite him, although the theme of imaginary loves of Sappho attracted the attention of the Heracleot in his treatise on the poetess (see **28**). The same goes for the two lines of Aeschylus of Alexandria, a poet considered with good reason to be of the Caesarian age (see *TrGF*, vol. 1, p. 312 Snell and *RE* I.1, s.v. “Aischylos” [14], coll. 1084-85) and an imitator, in his *Messeniakà*, of Rhianus, a contemporary of Eratosthenes (see Susemihl, p. 402 n. 157b). The following quotations of tragic poets, then, derive from an anthology: so Wilamowitz on the basis of the recurrence of these verses in Stobaeus (see above).

¹ The long elegiac fragment of Critias on Anacreon came, in the opinion of Wilamowitz, from Chamaeleon: the only elements that seem to trace it again to him are the existence of his treatise *On Anacreon* (see **39**) and the similarity with the cases of **27**, in which Chamaeleon uses Archytas talking about Alcman, and of

De Simonidis vita et avaritia

- [59] *Vita Simonidis* in *POxy.* XV 1800, s. II-III p. Chr., fr. 1 col. 2.36-48, (pp. 138-139 Hunt) : trib. Scorza, pp. 21-22

περὶ Σιμωνίδου
Σιμωνίδης τὸ μὲν γένος ἦν

36 (and perhaps 51), where Chamaeleon seems to use Xenophanes talking about Simonides.

² See 27.

³ The information regarding Stesichorus seems to come from a biographical context, given the vagueness of the contents of this passage and the absence of evidence about the interest of Stesichorus in love poetry (see Ercoles, pp. 329-31). The existence of Chamaeleon's *On Stesichorus* is the only data that can justify, in some way, the Chamaeleonic origin of this notice.

⁴ The passage associating Aeschylus and Sophocles shows a certain affinity with the 'method of Chamaeleon'. It reports the notice that the two had no hesitation representing loves of all kinds, including that of Achilles for Patroclus in the *Myrmidons* and for children in the *Niobe*. Therefore, in general, this passage is similar to 43: the latter states that, by presenting characters in a state of drunkenness, Aeschylus was meant to be drunk while composing his tragedies; in the former, the fact that Aeschylus and Sophocles portrayed disreputable loving implies that both dedicated themselves to this kind of love. Note also that a few lines later (*Deipn.* 13. 602e) Athenaeus gives two fragments, one from the *Myrmidons* of Aeschylus (Aesch. *TrGF* fr. 135 Radt), and another from the *Colchians* by Sophocles (Soph. *TrGF* fr. 345 Radt), both evidently devoted to homosexual love, the former between Achilles and Patroclus, the latter between Zeus and Ganymedes.

⁵ For the passages on Ibycus and Pindar, the most recent editors of their fragments indicate Chamaeleon as the source (see fr. 386 Davies of Ibycus: Davies, as Page did, indicates in brackets 'Ath. 601F ὡς φησι Χαμαιλέων'; fr. 127 Snell-Maehler of Pindar: in the apparatus 'Chamael. ap. Athen. 13.76 p. 601c', based on what Wehrli stated in the comment to fr. 25 of his edition). No evidence about an interest in Ibycus can be found in Chamaeleon's fragments; the existence of his *Περὶ Πινδάρου* and a similar context ascribed to him for the poet Alcman (without indication of the title of the source, see 27) can only partially allow suspicion that this information comes from a treatise of his.

The hypothesis of attribution is suggestive, but requires the assumption that these passages of Chamaeleon reached Athenaeus from several different works of his (the *Περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος*, the *Περὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος* (?), the *Περὶ Στησιχόρου*, the *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου*, the *Περὶ Πινδάρου*), or that there was a Chamaeleonic treatise dedicated to erotic poetry, unless one wants to believe that all these fragments are derived from one of the treatises of which we know the title. In this case, the only possibilities of attribution are to *Protreptikos* or, better, to *On Pleasure*, to which seems to fit the allusion to ἀκολασία (line 16) and the presence of a call to μετριότης throughout this section of *Deipnosophistai*.

Simonides' Life and Avarice

[59] Anonymus, *Life of Simonides*, in *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* 15 1800, fr. 1 col. 2.36-48

On Simonides. Simonides was Cean, from the city of Ioulis; his father was Leoprepes and he was fond of money. Some

Κεῖος πόλεως δὲ Ἰουλίδος
πατρὸς δὲ Λεοπρέπο[υς, γέγο-
40 νεν δὲ φιλάργυρος· τ[ινὲς
δ' αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν μνημο-
νικῶν εὕρησιν προσ[τιθέα-
σι· καὶ αὐτὸς δέ που [τοῦτο
φαίνει διὰ τῶν ἐπιγ[ραμ-
45 μ[άτ]λων· προσευρεῖ[ν δέ φα-
σιν αὐτόν τινες καὶ δ[...]
κε[...].]στον τῶν κδ' ἀπ[...]
τ[...].]...εὐ[...].]ησασ[...].]εν[...]

Simonides T 39a Poltera cf. **36** 36-43 *Sud.lex.* σ 439 *Adler s.v.* Σιμωνίδης
(= *T 39b Poltera*) *nec non* *Sud.lex.* σ 440 *s.v.* Σιμωνίδης 40-43 *Call. fr.*
64.9-14 *Pfeiffer* (= *T 80 Poltera*), *Cic. Fin.* 2.104 (= *T 80b Poltera*), *Cic. De orat.*
2.86 (= *T 80c Poltera*), *Quint. Inst. or.* 11.2.11 (= *T 80d Poltera*), *Plin. NH* 7.89 (= *T 81 Poltera*), *Arist. Or.* 28.59-60 (= *T 82 Poltera*), *Longin. Rh.* 1.2,201-2 *Hammer*
(= *T 82 Poltera*), *Amm. Marc.* 16.5.8 (= *T 84 Poltera*), *Marm. Par. FrGHist* 239.54

omnia rest. Hunt

Anacreon, de Eurypyla

[60] *POxy.* LIV 3722, s. II p. Chr., fr. 27, 6-7 Mähler (p. 25 Mähler) :
trib. Molfino, p. 319 cum adn. 8

δ[...].
[...].]θαί[...]
[...].]ιφει[...]
πάλιν ἐπ[...].]φ[...].]
5 γὰρ τοῦτο[...]
6a Εὐρυπύλη[...]
6] ταύτην α[...]
περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος α[...]
] ημεκκινε[...]
]ερη γυναῖκα[...].]
10]κασ αιμ[...]
]....[

cf. **39** et **50** 6a cf. *Anacreontem fr. 8 Gentili nec non Anth. Pal.* 7.31.10
(*Dioscoridem*) et *Anth. Pal.* 7.27.5 (*Antipatrum Sidonium*)

4 πάλιν ἐπ[ι]φέρει[...] *dub. Mähler* 5 γὰρ τοῦτο *divisi* 6a Εὐρυπύλη[...]
Mähler 6 ταύτην *Mähler* 7 περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος *dub. Molfino* 8] μή

attribute to him the invention of mnemonics. And he somewhere in his epigrams shows that. Some say that he found ...

Scorza, pp. 21-22: “Ma anche nel papiro di Oxyrhynchus contrassegnato col numero 1800, di cui abbiamo avuto occasione di parlare ampiamente a proposito dell’opera di Cameleonte su Saffo, vediamo ricomparire questa accusa al carattere di Simonide. [...] Come si ricorderà, riguardo la personalità dell’autore delle biografie contenute in questo papiro 1800 siamo perfettamente all’oscuro; l’unica autorità determinata che egli cita è Cameleonte nel brano riferentesi a Saffo; altrove egli si accontenta di un vago «alcuni dicono». – Non è quasi spontaneo pertanto pensare che anche il Περὶ Σιμωνίδου di Cameleonte sia stato in parte utilizzato nella biografia di Simonide da questo ignoto autore che mostrava di conoscere qualcosa del libro di Saffo del nostro peripatetico?”

The proposal of glimpsing Chamaeleon as the source of some informations contained in the brief biographical section on Simonides of *POxy.* 1800 is based on two points: the first and most important is the occurrence in this passage, among the typical features of the poet, of the charge of avarice, which we can also find in **36** and **51**; the second, less convincing, consists only in the presence of Chamaeleon (**29**) as *auctoritas* expressly mentioned by those who drew up this series of portraits of poets. But we have not enough data to say that even the information about the invention of mnemonics can be attributed to the Peripatetic.

Anacreon, on Eurypyle

[60] Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 54 3722 fr. 27.6-7 Mähler

5 ... again ...
6 ... in fact this ...
6a ... Eyrypyle ...
6 ... her
... on Anacreon ...
... women¹ ...

Molfino, p. 319 n. 8: “Ateneo (XII 533 e = Chamael. fr. 36 Wehrli = 44 Giordano² [**39**]) riporta il testo di Anacr. 8 Gent., riferendo che Cameleonte Pontico ne trattava nel Περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος. Si può avanzare l’ipotesi che l’opera di Cameleonte (di cui si leggerebbe alla l. 7 il titolo Περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος) fosse la fonte (anche indiretta) dalla quale il commentatore attingeva le sue notizie riguardo ad Eurypyle.”

The occurrence of the name of Eurypyle and the presence of the expression περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος suggests that the source of this section of the commentary on Anacreon is the homonymous book written by Chamaeleon, who was certainly partial to the sentimental events that connect the poet of Ceos and the woman in

306 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

μ' ἐκεῖ νει[*aut* μή με κείνει (*lege* κίνει) *dub. Mähler* 9]έρη γυναῖκα *aut fortasse* δυσχ]ερῇ γυναῖκα, *sed potest etiam dividi*]ερη γῦναι κα[

De Aeschylo puero, qui, in somnio, a Dionyso tragoedias facere iussus est

- [61] Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio*, 1.21.2 (*BT* vol. 1 p. 45.12-16 Rocha-Pereira) : trib. Schöll, p. 52, refutavit Scorza, p. 34 adn. 1

ἔφη δὲ Αἰσχύλος μειράκιον ὦν καθεύδειν ἐν ἀγρῷ φυλάσσων σταφυλάς, καί οἱ Διόνυσον ἐπιστάντα κελεῦσαι τραγωδίαν ποιεῖν· ὥς δὲ ἦν ἡμέρα – πείθεσθαι γὰρ ἐθέλειν – ῥᾶστα ἤδη πειρώμενος ποιεῖν. οὗτος μὲν ταῦτα ἔλεγεν.

Aesch. TrGF T 111 Radt = Ion Chius fr. dub. 133 Leurini, cf. etiam Aesch. TrGF T 1.2 Radt νέος ἦρξατο τῶν τραγωδιῶν *cf. 34A-C*

1 ὦν *V¹ F Ma L* : ὄν *VP* 4 ταῦτα *Ms* : τὰ αὐτὰ *VFLP MS^{mg}* οὖν τὰ αὐτὰ *Ma*

De Aeschylo qui ebrius tragoedias componebat

- [62] Plutarchus, *Quaestiones convivales* 7.10.2 715e (*BT* vol. 4 p. 255.1-4 Hubert) : trib. Pfeiffer, p. 281

ὥσπερ καὶ τὸν Αἰσχύλον ἱστοροῦσι τὰς τραγωδίας ἐμπίνοντα ποιεῖν, καὶ οὐχ, ὥς Γοργίας εἶπεν, ἐν τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ μεστὸν Ἄρεως εἶναι, τοὺς Ἑπτ' ἐπὶ Θήβας, ἀλλὰ πάντα Διονύσου.

Aesch. TrGF T 117g Radt, sed cf. etiam TrGF T 117a-f Radt et 43A-B nec non

question. In fact it is surprising in this commentary, whose remains are in very bad shape and in which we find quotations from Peripatetic and Alexandrian authorities (see Martano, pp. 25-26), that Chamaeleon is entirely absent, even though he wrote specifically on Anacreon.

¹ On the possibility of integration and division of the surviving letters of this line see Martano, p. 20 and n. 10.

Aeschylus when a Youth, While Dreaming Was Bidden by Dionysus to Write Tragedies

[61] Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 1.21.2

Aeschylus himself said that, when a youth, he slept while guarding grapes in a field, and Dionysus appeared and bade him write tragedy. When day came – in obedience to the vision – he made an attempt and hereafter found composing quite easy.

Schöll, p. 52: “Quae cum ita sint, etiam quam de Aeschylo Pausanias exhibet historiolum prorsus similem, ad Chamaeleontem referre licet: ἔφη – ἔλεγεν. Quamquam de his etiam alia ratio in promptu est, quae mihi certe praestare videtur. etenim cum uno loco Pausanias aperte Ioni Chii commentarium exscripserit, nescio an potius ex illo etiam haec promanarint, ut Pausaniae cum Chamaeleonte concentus ad communem auctorem Ionem redeat.”

Scorza, p. 34 n. 1: “inoltre mi sembra che l’autore proceda in modo non poco arbitrario quando dichiara che l’aneddoto narrato da Pausania (I,21,3) e riguardante la prima giovinezza di Eschilo – Dioniso appare al giovane addormentato e lo spinge a comporre tragedie – doveva provenire da Cameleonte solo perché un aneddoto consimile Pausania narrava di Pindaro, ed Eustazio dimostrava essere derivato da Cameleonte.”

As Scorza carefully notes, the opinion of Schöll, undermined by suspicion that the information on Aeschylus comes to Pausanias and, perhaps, to Chamaeleon from a common source, the *Epidēmiai* of Ion of Chios (see app. loc. par. and *RE* IX.2, s.v. “Ion” (11), coll. 1861-68 and *DNP* 5, s.v. “Ion aus Chios”, coll. 1075-76 [B. Zimmermann]), has no more evidence than the similarity with the episode of Pindar (34A-C). It is true that the nature of these stories can only suggest a biographical source not dissimilar, in method, from Chamaeleon, but it’s not enough to say that this passage comes from his *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου*.

Aeschylus Wrote His Tragedies while Drunk

[62] Plutarchus, *Table Talk* 7.10.2.715d-e

Just as they report that Aeschylus wrote his tragedies drunk, and that one of his plays, that is the *Seven against Thebes*, was not, as Gorgias said, “full of Ares”, but all were “full of Dionysus”.

Pfeiffer, p. 281: “These polemics against Gorgias stressing the point that *all* the plays of Aeschylus are ‘full of Dionysus’ are derived from a Peripatetic source,

Plut. fr. 130 Sandbach et QC 1.5.1 622e Hubert 2-3 cf. Gorgiam 82 B 24 D.-K. (Plut. QC 7.10.2 715e), ubi hunc Athenaei locum non inveni

3 μεστὸν *Reiske* : μέγιστον Ἄρεως γ (*et Ald.*) : ἀραίως

De Aeschyli arte tragica

[63] *Vita Aeschyli*, 1-2, 5-7 Radt (*TrGF* T1, pp. 31-33): trib. Schöll, pp. 49-50, refutavit Scorza, p. 34 adn. 1

νέος δὲ (*scil.* Αἰσχύλος) ἥρξατο τῶν τραγωδιῶν καὶ πολὺ τοὺς πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ ὑπερῆρεν κατὰ τε τὴν ποίησιν καὶ τὴν διάθεσιν τῆς σκηνῆς τὴν τε λαμπρότητα τῆς χορηγίας καὶ τὴν σκευὴν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν τὴν τε τοῦ χοροῦ σεμνότητα, ὥς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης· 5

ἀλλ' ὦ πρῶτος τῶν Ἑλλήνων πυργώσας ῥήματα σεμνὰ καὶ κοσμήσας τραγικὸν λῆρον.

[...] κατὰ δὲ τὴν σύνθεσιν τῆς ποιήσεως ζηλοῖ τὸ ἀδρὸν αἰεὶ πλάσμα, ὀνοματοποιίαις τε καὶ ἐπιθέτοις ἔτι δὲ μεταφοραῖς καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς δυναμένοις ὄγκον τῇ φράσει 10 περιθεῖναι χρώμενος. αἱ τε διαθέσεις τῶν δραμάτων οὐ πολλὰς αὐτῷ περιπετείας καὶ πλοκάς ἔχουσιν ὥς παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις· μόνον γὰρ ζηλοῖ τὸ βάρος περιτιθέναι τοῖς προσώποις, ἀρχαῖον εἶναι κρίνων τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἥρωϊκόν, τὸ δὲ πανοῦργον κομψοπρεπὲς τε καὶ 15 γνωμολογικὸν ἀλλότριον τῆς τραγωδίας ἡγούμενος· ὥστε διὰ τὸ πλεονάζειν τῷ βάρει τῶν προσώπων κωμωδεῖται παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ Νιόβῃ ἕως τρίτου μέρους ἐπικαθημένη τῷ τάφῳ τῶν παίδων οὐδὲν φθέγγεται ἐγκεκαλυμμένη· ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ἑκτορος λύτροις Ἀχιλλεὺς 20 ὁμοίως ἐγκεκαλυμμένος οὐ φθέγγεται, πλὴν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ὀλίγα πρὸς Ἑρμῆν ἀμοιβαῖα. διὸ ἐκλογαὶ μὲν παρ' αὐτῷ τῇ κατασκευῇ διαφέρουσιν πάμπολλαι ἂν εὐρεθεῖεν, γινώμαι δὲ ἢ συμπάθειαι ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν δυναμένων εἰς δάκρυα

probably Chamaeleon's *Περὶ Αἰσχύλου*, see fr. 40 a and b, F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 9 (1957) 61 and commentary 85f."

The attribution of this passage to Chamaeleon is justified by the anecdote that Aeschylus used to compose his tragedies in a state of drunkenness (see **43A-B**). This passage, in addition to what we read in Athenaeus, seems to evoke some controversy against Gorgias' claim that the plays of Aeschylus were "full of Ares", saying they were "full of Dionysus" and hinting in this way, at least in a reading that goes back to Chamaeleon, not to the wealth of religious inspiration, but to the dedication of the poet of Eleusis to wine.

Aeschylus' Tragic Art

[63] Anonymus, *Life of Aeschylus* 1-2, 5-7

(Aeschylus) began writing tragedies when young and far surpassed those who had preceded him in poetry, in staging, in the splendor of his *choregia*, in clothing the actors, and in the solemnity of the dance, as Aristophanes (says): "But, first, among the Greeks you heaped up solemn words and adorned the tragic chatter." . . .

In the composition of his poetry, then, he strives for a grand style, using the coinage of words and epithets and metaphors and everything capable of giving gravity to expression. The trajectories of his plays do not have many reversals and complications, like those of the most recent poets; he strives only to surround the characters with gravity, judging that the grand and heroic were archaic features, but believing that affected craftiness and sententiousness were alien to tragedy: so, he is parodied by Aristophanes for the excessive weightiness of his characters. In the *Niobe*, in fact, she sits by the grave of her children until the third act saying nothing and shrouded in a veil. In the *Ransom of Hector* Achilles, also shrouded, does not speak, except for a few exchanges at the beginning with Hermes. So you can find in him very many passages that are outstanding in their design, but no sentiments or affections or anything else that can

ἀγαγεῖν οὐ πάνυ. ταῖς τε {γὰρ} ὄψεσι καὶ τοῖς μύθοις 25
πρὸς ἑκπληξιν τερατώδη μάλλον ἢ πρὸς ἀπάτην κέχρηται.

4 σεμνότητα cf. *Aristoph. Ran.* 833, 1004, 1020, 1061 (= *Aesch. TrGF* T120.833, 1004, 1020, 1061 *Radt*), *Men. Asp.* 425 *Jacques* (= *TrGF* T126), *Dion. Halic. De Demosth.* 38 (= *TrGF* T128b2.32) *Aristid. Or.* 22(19).11 (= *TrGF* T137.4) 6-7 *Aristoph. Ran.* 1004-1005 (= *TrGF* T120.1004-5) 9 cf. *Aristoph. Ran.* 940 (= *TrGF* T120.940), *Plut. De prof. in virt.* 7.79B (= *TrGF* T116.2), *Psell.* Ἑρμηνεῖαι εἰς κοινολεξίας 5 ed. *Sathas*, Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη 5, 1876, 538 (= *TrGF* T141a.6-8) 13 βάρος cf. *Aristoph. Ran.* 940-41, 1367-1410 (= *TrGF* T120.940-41, 1367-1410), *Aristid. Or.* 3(46). 65 (= *TrGF* T137.6) 14 ἀρχαῖον cf. *Dion. Halic. De comp. verb.* 22 (= *TrGF* T128a24), *De Demosth.* 38 (= *TrGF* T128b2,23,32), *Dionem Chrys.* 52(335).4 (= *TrGF* T135.4) *Anth. Pal.* 7.411 (*Dioscor.*) (= *TrGF* T163.6) 14 τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές cf. *Dion. Halic. De imit.* 2 fr. 6.2.10 (*TrGF* T127.2), *De comp. verb.* 22 (= *TrGF* T128a.12), *De Demosth.* 38 (= *TrGF* T128b.12), μεγαλοφυΐα *Schol. Aesch. Prom.* 175 *Herington* (= *TrGF* T130.1), μεγαλόφρων *Dion. Halic. De comp. Verb.* 22 (= *TrGF* T128a.23-4), μεγαλοφώνότατον *Phot. Bibl. cod.* 158.101b4 *Henry* (= *TrGF* T136.5) 16-22. cf. *Aristoph. Ran.* 911-26 (= *TrGF* T120.911-26) 17-18 τῷ βάρει cf. *ad v.* 14 20-22 cf. *app. loc. par. in Aesch. TrGF pp.* 265-66 *Radt* 26 ἑκπληξιν cf. *Aristoph. Ran.* 962 (= *TrGF* T120.962 *et app. ad loc.*) τερατώδη cf. *Aristoph. Ran.* 834 (= *TrGF* T120.834)

2 ἑαυτοῦ *MC^{pc}WXXc* : αὐτοῦ *cett.* ὑπερήρεν *Wilamowitz* : -ῆρεν *M*, -ῆρε *A*, -ῆρε *VaTZh* τε *MDVaTZh* : γε *B*, *om. cett.* 4 καὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν *Va* 5 φησὶ περὶ τούτου (αὐτοῦ *Pd*) *post* Ἀριστοφάνης *add. K* (*teste Turyn, Manus. Trad. Trag. Aesch., p. 77*) *PPd*, φησί(ν) *TZh* 6 πρῶτε *VaZh* 7 λῆρον *MDP^{ac}TVa* : κλῆρον *cett.* 8 σύνθεσιν *MBDNVaXZh* : *mutilus est T*, θέσιν *cett.* ἀσκεῖ (*pro* ζηλοῖ) *TZh* ἀδρὸν *Zh* 9 πλάσμα *post* ἀδρὸν *Va*, *om. TZh* καὶ ὑπέρογκον *ante* ὀνοματοποιίαις *add. TZh* 10 μεταφοαῖς *MDTVaXZh* : καὶ μεταφοαῖς *cett.* *post* δυναμένοις *deficit X* ὄγκος (*ut vid.*) *T* : ὄγκω *Va* 11 περιθεῖναι τῇ φράσει *PPdXc*, περιθῆναι (*om.* τῇ φράσει) *Zh* χρώμενος *om. Zh* 11-12 αὐτῷ *ante* τῶν *add. et post* οὐ πολλὰς *om. TZh* 12 καὶ πλοκάς *om. Va* 12-13 ὥσπερ τοῖς *Va* 13 δὲ (*pro* γὰρ) *P^{vp}Zh* ζητεῖ *P*, σπουδάζει *TZh* μέγεθος καὶ ὄγκος (*pro* τὸ βάρος) *TZh* 13-14 περιτιθέναι τοῖς προσώποις *MBDTVazh* : τοῖς προσώποις περιτιθέναι *PPd*, τοῖς προσώποις *cett.* 14 *post* ἀρχαῖον *deficit D* 14-15 τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές καὶ *scripsit Radt* : τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές τε καὶ *TZh* (*prob. Wilamowitz*), τοῦτο τὸ μέρος μεγαλοπρεπές τε καὶ *cett.*; τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, τὸ μεγαλοπρεπές τε καὶ *ed. pr., Page* 15 ἡρωϊκόν – τε καὶ *om. Zh* 16 ἡγήσατο *Zh* 16-22 ὥστε – ἀμοιβαῖα *om. TZh* 18 Ἀριστοφάνει *BXc et fort. M* (*compendium incertum*) (*coniecerat Bergk, Hermes* 18, 1883, p. 483 *adn. 1*) : -ους *cett.* <Νιόβη> *post* Νιόβη *add. Bothe, Aesch. Trag., p. 4 adn.*

lead to tears. He uses spectacles and plots to create an ominous shock rather than deception.

Schöll, pp. 49-50: “Hoc et alii laudarunt iudicio et Dindorfius ‘ex optimo et antiquissimo fonte petiisse biographum’ censuit ‘verbosis recentiorum multorum de Aeschylea poesi scriptorum disputationibus anteferenda, qui tragicis graecis non pauca affinxerunt de quibus illi nunquam cogitaverant.’ Neque tamen quis auctor ille fuerit diligentius inquisivit, nisi quod antea Chamaeleontis Heracleotae Peripatetici scriptionem περὶ Αἰσχύλου commemorasse satis habuit. Itemque Ernestus Koepke ubi haud inutiliter de Chamaeleontis vita librorumque disseruit, in universum dixit ‘nihil obstare, quin nonnullas Chamaeleontis adnotationes in hanc vitam transiisse credamus,’ At hoc parum est [...] Nam etiam quod totum dicendi genus peripateticam disciplinam redolet, non sufficit ad persuadendum, cum artis aestimatio ab illa omnis omnino apud veteres dependeat. Sed habemus unde certius aliquid colligere possimus Chamaeleontis fragmentum, [...] Χαμαιλέων γοῦν πρῶτον αὐτόν φησι (Αἰσχύλον) σχηματίσαι τοὺς χοροὺς ὀρχηστοδιδασκάλοις οὐ χρησάμενον, [...] Ἀριστοφάνης γοῦν – παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἢ περὶ τῶν τραγικῶν ἀποκεῖται πίστις – ποιεῖ αὐτὸν Αἰσχύλον λέγοντα· ‘τοῖς χοροῖς αὐτὸς τὰ σχήματ’ ἐποίουν’ [...] Iam vero attendendum est in illo vitae Aeschyliae loco non modo bis Aristophanem testem excitari [...] verum etiam cetera omnia ad Aristophanis mentem composita esse.”

Scorza, p. 34 n. 1: “Ma anche se si vuole ammettere che il brano di Aristofane e la frase παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἢ περὶ τῶν τραγικῶν ἀποκεῖται πίστις Ateneo li abbia attinti da Cameleonte (lo Schöll, *De locis nonnullis ad Aeschyli vitam et ad historiam tragoediae graecae pertinentibus epistula*, pag. 30, sgg. e il Leo, *Die griech. röm. Biographie*, pag. 104 sg. sono appunto di questo parere), non credo che da ciò si possano trarre le conseguenze che ne ricava lo Schöll. Fra l’altro egli afferma, ad es., che un lungo brano della vita anonima di Eschilo deve provenire da Cameleonte, solo perché in due punti ci si riporta all’autorità di Aristofane: l’affermazione può considerarsi avventata.”

The long passage in the life of Aeschylus, for which Schöll suggests Chamaeleon as the source, reports a series of reviews on the poetry of the poet of Eleusis, judgments that are reflected in what is clearly expressed in the long passage from Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, in which the comic poet made a long examination of the formal and stylistic characteristics of the tragedies of Aeschylus. The basis, then, of this attribution is what we find in Athenaeus: παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἢ περὶ τῶν τραγικῶν ἀποκεῖται πίστις, a view on whose origins many questions have been raised (see 44), but which has been associated with Chamaeleon. The *Life of Aeschylus* never mentions his Περὶ Αἰσχύλου, and yet there is a lack reference to any other source as well, but the parallel with the *Life of Sophocles* (which often cites Ister and Satyrus) and the *Life of Euripides* (Satyrus) can validate the suspicion that Chamaeleon’s treatise *On Aeschylus* could have been an important source for the biographical data of the poet of Eleusis, even if the doubt raised by Scorza remains valid.

16 ('*quod aures graecae non tolerabant*' Wilamowitz) 18-19 τρίτου μέρος *M*: τρίτης ἡμέρας *cett.* (*def. Turyn, Man. Trad. Trag. Aesch., p. 16 adn. 15; Taplin, Aesch. Silences and Silences in Aesch., p. 61 adn. 12, al. : at vide ZPE 42, 1981, p. 1sqq.*) 20 ἐν τε *M* τοῖς τοῦ Ἑκτορος 'Α' *Va*^s λουτροῖς 'Α' *Va* 20-21 ἐγκεκαλυμμένος ὁμοίως ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς 'Α' 22-23 ἐκλογαὶ - πάμπολλαι *cett.*: ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τοῖς δράμασιν αὐτοῦ πλείστα *TZh* 23 πάμπολλοι *M*, πάμπολοι *C*, πάμπολυ *N* 23-24 γνώμη δὲ ἢ συμπάθεια *Zh* 24 δάκρυα *T*: δάκρυ *R* (*teste Wilamowitz*) *Va*, δάκρυον *cett.* 25 ἀγαγεῖν *MTZh*: ἐπαγαγεῖν *P.*, ἀπαγαγεῖν *cett.* {γάρ} *corr. Wilamowitz* 25-26 ταῖς - κέχρηται *om. TZh*

De Aeschyli epigrammate funerario
quod ipse sibi composuit

[64A] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.23 627c-d (*BT* vol. 3 pp. 384.9-13 Kaibel) : trib. Schöll, p. 51

ὁμοίως καὶ Αἰσχύλος τηλικαύτην δόξαν ἔχων διὰ τὴν ποιητικὴν οὐδὲν ἦττον ἐπὶ τοῦ τάφου ἐπιγραφῆναι ἠξίωσεν μᾶλλον τὴν ἀνδρείαν, ποιήσας·

ἀλκὴν δ' εὐδόκιμον Μαραθῶνιον ἄλσος ἂν εἴποι
καὶ βαθυχαῖταί κεν Μῆδοι ἐπιστάμενοι.

5

cf. Plut. De exilio 13.604d (= TrGF T 88 Radt), Anon. in Arist. Eth. Nic. 3.2.1111a8, ed. Heylbut, CAG 20,145,23 (= TrGF T93b Radt)

1 διὰ τὴν *A*: κατὰ τὴν *dub. Kaibel* 4 ἀνείποι *A* 5 βαθυχεταικεν *A*, *rectius haec in vita Aeschyli notavit Kaibel, cf. infra 64C*

[64B] Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio* 1.14.5 (*BT* vol. 1 p. 32.17-22 Rocha-Pereira) : trib. Schöll, p. 51

καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ Αἰσχύλος, ὥς οἱ τοῦ βίου προσεδοκάτο ἡ τελευτή, τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἐμνημόνευσεν οὐδενός, δόξης

Aeschylus' Funerary Epigram,
Which He Composed by Himself

[64A] Athenaeus, *The Sophists at Dinner* 14.23 627c-d

Similarly Aeschylus also, for all the great reputé that he enjoys because of his poetry, nonetheless thought it right to have his bravery recorded by preference on his tomb, having composed this inscription: "Of his glorious might the grove at Marathon could tell, and the long-haired Medes – for they know!"

Schöll, p. 51: "Itaque epigrammate illo, quod contra Teuffelii edictum cum Schneidewino aliisque confidenter ipsi Aeschylo attribuo, Chamaeleon usus esse videtur. Hoc enim et Athenaeus profert, quem pleraque de Aeschylo ex Chamaeleonte decerpisse manifestum est, et Pausanias ita commemorat, ut sententiam cum Athenaeo prorsus congruam de eo ferat. Pausaniam autem aut ipsum Chamaeleontem aut cognatum certe auctorem excerpisse praeter hunc cum Athenaeo consensum altera de Pindaro narratiuncula arguit: [...]."

The attribution of this passage of Athenaeus on the funerary epigram, which Aeschylus composed for himself, and similar consideration for a passage of Pausanias dedicated to the same subject, are based on two points: firstly, the fact that Athenaeus repeatedly uses Chamaeleon as a source of information on Aeschylus (8, 42-44); second, the fact that, by agreeing on the story and the epigram and, elsewhere, on the account of Pindar's initiation to poetry, Pausanias and Athenaeus suggest they have Chamaeleon as a common source on several occasions (35 and app. loc. par.). Among these cases is also the present one. Actually, none of the reasons given by Schöll seems final.

[64B] Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 1.14.5

While Aeschylus, who had won such renown for his poetry and for his share in the naval battles before Artemisium and

314 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

ἐς τοσοῦτο ἦκων ἐπὶ ποιήσει καὶ πρὸ Ἀρτεμισίου καὶ ἐν
Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχήσας, ὃ δὲ τό τε ὄνομα πατρόθεν καὶ
τὴν πόλιν ἔγραψε καὶ ὡς τῆς ἀνδρείας μάρτυρας ἔχοι τὸ 5
Μαραθῶνι ἄλσος καὶ Μήδων τοὺς ἐς αὐτὸ ἀποβάντας.

Aesch. TrGF T 162 Radt

3 τοσοῦτο *R Va* : τοῦτο β ποιήσει *Xylander* : ποίησιν β 4 πατρόθεν
Porson : προτεθέν β

[64C] *Vita Aeschyli* 11 (*TrGF* T1 *Radt*, pp. 34-35) : trib. Schöll, p. 53

ἀποθανόντα δὲ (*scil.* Αἰσχύλον) Γελῶι πολυτελῶς ἐν
τοῖς δημοσίοις μνήμασι θάψαντες ἐτίμησαν μεγαλοπρεπῶς 5
ἐπιγράφαντες οὕτω·

Αἰσχύλον Εὐφορίωνος Ἀθηναῖον τόδε κεύθει
μνῆμα καταφθίμενον πυροφόροιο Γέλας·
ἀλκὴν δ' εὐδόκιμον Μαραθῶνιον ἄλσος ἂν εἴποι
καὶ βαθυχαιτήεις Μῆδος ἐπιστάμενος.

Aesch. TrGF T 162 Radt

1 ἀποθανόντος *CVVaXc* πολυτελῶς *om. Zh* 3 οὕτω *M* : οὕτως *CTZh*,
τοῦτο *PPd*, τούτῳ *cett.* ἐπίγραμμα εἰς τὸν τάφον Αἰσχύλου *post*
οὕτως *add. Zh* 4 ἐπίγραμμα *M^{ms}* Ἀθηναίων *MZh* 5 πυροφόροιο *BZh*
: παραφόροιο *M^{ac}*, πυρειφόροιο *Xc*, *mutilus est T*, πυραφόροιο *cett.* Γέλας
Plut. de exil. 13.604d (=TrGF T88 Radt) : σέλας *BXc (et, ut vid., T)*, πέλας
cett. 6 δ' *om. Zh* ἄλλος *MCNP^{yp}Va (mutilus est T)* ἂν εἴποι *om. Zh* 7
βαθυχαιτήης *M^{ac}*, βαθυχαιτείης *Zh*

at Salamis, recorded at the prospect of death nothing else, but merely wrote his name, his father's name, and the name of his city, and added that he had witness to his valour in the grove at Marathon and in the Persians who landed there.

See **64A**

[64C] Anonymus, *Life of Aeschylus* 11

The inhabitants of Gela sumptuously buried the dead Aeschylus in a public monument and honored him grandly, inscribing these words: "This monument of Gela rich in wheat contains Aeschylus son of Euphorion, the Athenian, who perished here. Of his glorious might the grove at Marathon could tell, and the long-haired Mede – for he knows!"

Schöll, p. 53: "Ex ipsa vero vita Aeschyli quoniam cum alia tum quae de itinere siciliensi narratur ad Chamaeleontem revocavimus, etiam epigramma illud, quod ad sepulchrum Gelae factum refertur, ibi non minus quam in Athenaei loco a Chamaeleonte repetitum esse putabimus."

Schöll's argument is based on the fact that Chamaeleon would have used in several places Ion of Chios' *Epidêmiai* (see commentary on **61**) as a source for his information on Aeschylus ("Iam si reputaveris ipsius itineris Siciliensis prae ceteris Athenaeum, Pausaniam, Plutarchum auctores extitisse, non dubitabis hanc quoque memoriam ad Ionem revocare, unde eam et Athenaeus et biographus Aeschyli per Chamaeleontem acceperint."). This would have been happened even in the case of the trip to Sicily (not included in this collection), to which is united the epigram in Pausanias and in the anonymous' life of Aeschylus.

INDEX OF SOURCES

This index lists all texts printed in this collection and all other texts in which Chamaeleon is named. Square brackets indicate doubtful texts.

APOSTOLIUS, MICHAEL (15th cent. AD)		<i>ANECDOTA GRAECA</i>	
<i>Centuriae</i>		1.233,13-16 Bekker	3C
3.60	40A		
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (2nd cent. AD)		CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)	
<i>Deipnosophistae</i>		<i>Stromata</i>	
1.21d-f	44	1.14.60.3	3B
1.22a	43B	1.14.61.1-2	[52]
1.22e	12	1.26.170.3	14
1.22e-f	[54]		
4.184c-d	4	DIOGENES LAERTIUS (3rd cent. AD)	
5.192a	[56]	<i>Vitae philosophorum</i>	
6.273b-c	9	3.46	49
8.338b-d	33	5.92	1b = 16 = 25
8.347e-f	8		
9.373f-374b	46	EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (12th cent. AD)	
9.375d-f	42		
9.389f-390a	26	<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem</i>	
9.406e-407c	47	ψ 94	21B
10.427b-c	11	ψ 455	22B
10.428f-429a	43A	<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam</i>	
10.429a	[57]	ε 334	24B
10.429f-430a	13	<i>Prooemium commentariorum</i>	
10.456c-457a	37	<i>Pindaricorum</i>	
11.461a-d	10	27.12-13	34C
11.461c	[56]	HESYCHIUS ALEXANDRINUS (5th cent. AD)	
12.511c-d	[53]	<i>Lexicon</i>	
12.533e-534b	39	λ 946	48
13.573c-574b	35		
13.599c-d	28	MEMNON HERACLEOTA (1st cent. AD)	
13.600d-601c	[58]	<i>De Heracleia</i>	
13.600f-601a	27	<i>FrGrHist</i> 434 F 7	1a
13.611a	38		
14.620c	30	PAPYRI	
14.623f-624a	5	<i>POxy.</i>	
14.627c-d	[64A]	XIII 1611, fr. 5 + 43 + 40 + 6 + ?	31A
14.628d-e	45	XV 1800, fr. 1, coll. 1-2 ll. 2-35	29
14.656c-e	36	XV 1800, fr. 1, col. 2.36-48	[59]
		XXVI 2451B, fr. 1	34A
		XXIX 2506, fr. 26 c. I.2-26	32

Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica The Sources, Text and Translation 317

LIV 3722		2, 904-910a	17
fr. 27 ll. 6-7	[59]	<i>vet. in Aristophanis Nubes</i>	
fr. 73 ll. 3-4	[50]	967b α-β	31B
<i>PSI</i>		<i>vet. Tr. in Aristophanis Pacem</i>	
1093.31-33	3A	697e	[51]
		<i>in Homeri Iliadem</i>	
PAUSANIAS PERIEGETES (2nd cent. AD)		M 231a	18
<i>Graeciae descriptio</i>		T 62c	19
1.14.5	[64B]	Φ 390b	20
1.21.2	[61]	Ψ 94	21A
		Ψ 454	22A
PHILODEMUS GADAREUS (1st cent. AD)		<i>in Homeri Odysseam</i>	
<i>De musica</i>		ε 334	24A
4, coll. 46.45-47.22 Delattre	6		
4, col. 131.17-35 Delattre	7	<i>SUDA LEXICON</i> (10th cent. AD)	
		α 3668	40B
PHOTIUS (9th cent. AD)		α 3907	40C
<i>Bibliotheca</i>		ο 806	41
226a	1a		
<i>Lexicon</i>		TATIANUS (2nd cent. AD)	
α 2561	40D	<i>Oratio ad Graecos</i>	
		31	15
PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (1st-2nd cent. AD)		<i>VITA AESCHYLI</i>	
<i>Quaestiones convivales</i>		<i>TrGF</i> T1.1-2, 5-7 Radt	[63]
7.10.2.715e	[62]	<i>TrGF</i> T1.11 Radt	[64C]
SCHOLIA		<i>VITA PINDARI AMBROSIANA</i>	
<i>in Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica</i>		vol. 1 p. 1.6-11 Drachmann	34B
1, 139-144	23		

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

This index lists all passages cited in the upper and lower apparatus.

[ACRO] (2nd-3rd cent. AD)		<i>TrGF</i> F 139.1 Radt	48
<i>Scholia in Horatii Carmina</i>		<i>TrGF</i> F 309 Radt	42
1.16	32	<i>TrGF</i> F 310 Radt	42
		<i>TrGF</i> F 311 Radt	42
AELIANUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)			
<i>Varia Historia</i>		ALCAEUS (7th-6th cent. BC)	
9.24	9	fr. 346.1 Voigt	[54]
12.45	34A	fr. 346.4 Voigt	13
14.23	5	fr. 347.1-2 Voigt	[54]
		fr. 352 Voigt	[54]
AELIUS ARISTIDES (2nd cent. AD)			
<i>Orationes</i>		ALCMAN (7th cent. BC)	
3.65	[63]	fr. 39 Davies = 91 Cal.	26
22.11	[63]	fr. 59a Davies = 148 Cal.	27
28.59-60	[59]	fr. 59b Davies = 149 Cal.	27
AESCHYLUS (5th BC)		AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS (4th cent. BC)	
<i>TrGF</i> T 88 Radt	[64A]	<i>Res gestae</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> T 93b Radt	[63]	16.5.8	[59]
<i>TrGF</i> T 103 Radt	44		
<i>TrGF</i> T 111 Radt	[61]	ANACREON (6th-5th cent. BC)	
<i>TrGF</i> T 113b Radt	8	fr. 8 Gentili	39
<i>TrGF</i> T 116 Radt	[63]	fr. 13 Gentili	28
<i>TrGF</i> T 117a-f Radt	[62]	fr. 82 Gentili	39
<i>TrGF</i> T 117a Radt	43A		
<i>TrGF</i> T 117c Radt	43A	ANAXANDRIDES	
<i>TrGF</i> T 117d Radt	43A	<i>PCG</i> T 2 K.-A.	46
<i>TrGF</i> T 117f Radt	43A		
<i>TrGF</i> T 117g Radt	43A, [62]	<i>ANECDOTA GRAECA</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> T 120 Radt	[63]	<i>Anecdota Oxoniensia</i> , ed. Cramer	
<i>TrGF</i> T 126 Radt	[63]	1.121	35
<i>TrGF</i> T 127 Radt	[63]	2.284.20-21	21A
<i>TrGF</i> T 128a-b Radt	[63]		
<i>TrGF</i> T 130 Radt	[63]	ANONYMUS IN ARISTOTELIS <i>ETH. NIC.</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> T 135 Radt	[63]	3.2.111a8 Heylb.	[64A]
<i>TrGF</i> T 136 Radt	[63]		
<i>TrGF</i> T 137 Radt	[63]	ANTHOLOGIA <i>GRAECA</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> T 141a Radt	[63]	7.31	[60]
<i>TrGF</i> T 162 Radt	[64C]	7.27	[60]
<i>TrGF</i> T 163 Radt	[63]	7.411	[63]
<i>TrGF</i> F 135 Radt	[58]	9.184	25

Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica The Sources, Text and Translation 319

ANTIMACHUS COLOPHONIUS (5th-4th cent. BC)		<i>Pax</i>	
fr. 165 Matthews	15	697-99	36
		<i>Ranae</i>	
		833	[63]
APOLLODORUS (2nd cent. BC)		834	[63]
FGrHist 244 F63	15	868	8
		911	[63]
APOLLONIUS DYSCOLUS (2nd cent. AD)		940	[63]
<i>De pronomine</i>		962	[63]
p. 74.21-25 Schn.-Uhlig	1	1004	[63]
		1020	[63]
APOLLONIUS SOPHISTA (1st cent. AD)		1061	[63]
<i>Lexicon Homericum</i>		1367-1410	[63]
s.v. φoίvuξ p. 164.29 Bek.	22A	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
		F 696a-b K.-A.	44
APOSTOLIUS, MICHAEL (15th cent. AD)			
<i>Collectio paroemiarum</i>		ARISTOTELES (4th cent. BC)	
13.42	41	<i>Ethica Eudemia</i>	
		1.5 1216a 11ff.	9
APPENDIX PROVERBIORUM		<i>Poetica</i>	
4.32, v. 1, p. 441 Leu.-Schn.	39	3 1448a 12	47
		4 1449a 20-25	41
ARCHILOCHUS (7th cent. BC)		<i>Politica</i>	
T 32 Tarditi	30	7.17 1336b 15	10
		8.5 1340a1-1340b9	5
ARISTARCHUS (3rd-2nd cent. BC)		8.6 1341a 31	4
p. 26 adn. 9 Lehrs	18	<i>Rhetorica</i>	
		2.16 1391a 8	36
ARISTIAS (5th cent. BC)		2.20 1393a 30-31	48
TrGF 9 F 4 Sn.-Kann.	40A, 40B	3.2 1405b 23-29	36
		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
ARISTODEMUS		fr. 3 Rose ³	3B
FGrHist 383 F 1	17	fr. 4 Rose ³	[52]
		frr. 142-179 Rose ³	20
ARISTONICUS (1st cent. AD)		fr. 171a Rose ³	24A
<i>De signis Iliad.</i>		fr. 171b Rose ³	24A
p. 287 Friedlaender	22A	fr. 171c Rose ³	24A
p. 327 Friedlaender	21A	fr. 535 Rose ³	14
p. 332 Friedlaender	22A	fr. 548a-b Rose ³	14
ARISTOPHANES BYZANTIUS (3nd-2rd BC)			
p. 175 Slater	15	ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (2nd cent. AD)	
p. 197 Slater	24	<i>Deipnosophistae</i>	
		1.5a-b	47
		1.22a	44
ARISTOPHANES COMICUS (5th cent. BC)		8.362a	40A
<i>Acharnenses</i>		10.429a	14
850	39	10.430c	13

320 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

11.461c	10	CLINIAS (4th cent. BC)	
11.497e	10	54 A 4 D.-K.	5
11.499e	11		
12.511c	9	CLITARCHUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
12.520a	9	FGrHist 137 F 17	17
12.526b	9		
12.541b-c	9	CONON (1st cent. BC - 1st cent. AD)	
15.698c-f	47	<i>Narrationes</i>	
		<i>FGrHist</i> 26 F 1.18	32
AULUS GELLIUS (2nd cent. AD)			
<i>Noctes Atticae</i>		CRATES (5th cent. BC)	
3.11,2	15	<i>PCG</i> T 2a K.-A.	[57]
		<i>PCG</i> p. 85 K.-A.	[57]
BABRIUS			
<i>Fabulae</i>		CRATES MALLOTES (2nd cent. BC)	
107 - <i>Prol.</i> 2.5-6	48	fr. 73 Broggiato	15
CALLIMACHUS (3rd cent. BC)		CRITIAS (5th cent. BC)	
fr. 64 Pfeiffer	[59]	88 A15 D.-K.	4
fr. 452 Pfeiffer	15	88 D 1 D.-K.	[58]
CHOEROBOSCUS (6th cent. AD)		DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
<i>De ortographia</i>		fr. 1.108 SOD	48
<i>An. Ox. Cr.</i> 2, p. 216.33-34	21A		
<i>Scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini Canones isagogicos</i>		DIDYMUS CHALCENTERUS (1st cent. BC - 1st cent. AD)	
115.7 Hilgard	18	fr. 4, p. 372 Schmidt	[52]
131.17 Hilgard	18	p. 342 Ludwig	18
		p. 483 Ludwig	21A
CICERO (1st cent. BC)		DIO CHRYSOSTOMUS (1st-2nd cent. AD)	
<i>De finibus bonorum et malorum</i>		<i>Orationes</i>	
2.23	9	11.40	32
2.104	[59]	52.4	[63]
<i>De oratore</i>		64.23	34A
2.86	[59]		
CLEARCHUS SOLENSIS (4nd-3rd BC)		DIODORUS SICULUS (1st cent. BC)	
fr. 69d W	3A	<i>Bibliotheca historica</i>	
		8.19	9
CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)		DIOGENIANUS (2nd cent. AD)	
<i>Stromateis</i>		<i>Paroemiae</i>	
1.14.612	3A	<i>pr.</i> v. 1, p. 180.9-11 L.-S.	48
1.21.117	15	2.32, v. 1, p. 200 L.-S.	40A
		7.18, v. 1, p. 289 L.-S.	41

Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica The Sources, Text and Translation 321

DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSEUS (1st cent. BC - 1st cent. AD) <i>De compositione verborum</i> 22 [63] <i>De Demosthene</i> 38 [63] <i>De Imitatione</i> 2 [63]	EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (12th cent. AD) <i>Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem</i> 659.45ss. et 50-52 21B 1239.27 47 1273.6-8 46 1286.20 42 1298.55 8 1632.17 10 1632.18 12 <i>Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam</i> 1398.3-5 11 1598.58 43A 1821.30 36
DIONYSIUS SCHYTOBRACHION (2nd cent. BC) <i>FGrHist</i> 32 F 13 17	GORGAS (5th-4th cent. BC) 82 B 24 D.-K. [62]
DIPHILUS (4th-3rd cent. BC) <i>PCG</i> F 71 K.-A. 28 <i>PCG</i> F 372 K.-A. 39	HEGEMON (5th cent. BC) vv. 18-21 Brandt 47 p. 38 Brandt 47 <i>PCG</i> T 4 K.-A. 47
EPHORUS (4th cent. BC) <i>FGrHist</i> 70 F 98 15 <i>FGrHist</i> 70 F 174 14	HERACLIDES PONTICUS (4th cent. BC) fr. 1.92 Schütrumpf 16 fr. 45 Schütrumpf 39 fr. 105 Schütrumpf 16 fr. 109 Schütrumpf 30
ERATOSTHENES CYRENAEUS (3rd cent. BC) <i>FGrHist</i> 241 F 9a-b 15 IV p. 240 Bernhardt 15 XIV p. 213 Bernhardt 31A	HERMESIANAX (3rd cent. BC) fr. 7 Powell 28
ETYMOLOGICUM GENUINUM <i>ms. Vat. gr. 1818</i> s.v. κάρρων 1	HERMIPPUS (3rd-2nd cent. BC) <i>FGrHist</i> cont. F 29a/c Boll. = fr. 47a/c W 3A <i>FGrHist</i> cont. F 29b Boll. = fr. 47b W 3C
ETYMOLOGICUM MAGNUM 169.10-12 Gaisford 24A	HERMOGENES (2nd cent. AD) <i>Progymnasmata</i> 1.10 Rabe 48
EURIPIDES (5th cent. BC) <i>Cyclops</i> 557-558 40A	HERODOTUS (5th cent. BC) <i>Historiae</i> 2.53,116 ss. 15 6.84.1,3 11 6.127 9
EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS (3rd-4th cent. AD) <i>Preparatio evangelica</i> 5.30 12	

322 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

HESIODUS (8th-7th cent. BC)		LACTANTIUS (3rd-4th cent. AD)	
fr. 176 M.-W.	32	<i>Divinae Institutiones</i>	
T 85 Most	30	1.22.19	34A
T 149 Most	[52]		
		LASUS HERMIONAEUS	
HESYCHIUS ALEXANDRINUS (5th cent. AD)		T 9 Brussich	33
<i>Lexicon</i>			
π 1831 Hansen	39	LONGINUS RHETOR	
		<i>Ars Rhetorica</i>	
HIERONYMUS RHODIUS (3rd cent. BC)		1.2, pp. 201-2 Hammer	[59]
fr. 29 White	11		
		LUCIANUS (2nd cent. AD)	
HIMERIUS (4th cent. AD)		<i>Demosthenis encomium</i>	
<i>Orationes</i>		15	43A
66.1 Colonna	48		
		LYRICA ADESPOTA	
HIPPOLYTUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)		fr. adespot. 35 Page	2
<i>Elenchos</i>			
6.19,3 Wendland	32	MARMOR PARIUM (3rd cent. BC)	
		FrGHist 239.54	[59]
HOMERUS (9th centy. BC)			
<i>Ilias</i>		MEGACLIDES (4th cent. BC)	
1.69	22B	fr. 2 Janko	15
5.891	20		
6.132-133	17	MENANDER (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
13.460	19	<i>Aspis</i>	
<i>Odyssea</i>		425	[63]
8.351	[52]		
		MIMNERMUS (7th cent. BC)	
IBYCUS (6th cent. BC)		T 22 Gentili-Prato	30
fr. 286 Davies	[58]		
		MNESITHEUS ATHENIENSIS (4th cent. BC)	
ION CHIUS		fr. 41 Bertier	[54]
fr. dub. 133 Leurini	[61]	fr. 42 Bertier	[54]
fr. dub. 137 Leurini	43A		
		OENOMAEUS GADAREUS (2nd cent. AD)	
IRENÆUS (2nd cent. AD)		fr. 11b Hammerstädt	12
<i>Adversus haereses</i>			
1.16,2 Harvey	32	PAPYRI	
		<i>POxy.</i>	
ISOCRATES (5th-4th cent. BC)		XV 1800, fr. 1, col. 2, 36-40	36
<i>Helenae Encomium</i>			
64 (3-5) Mathieu	32	PARAPHRASIS ANTIQUIOR IN LYCOPHRONIS	
		ALEXANDRAM	
ISTER (3rd cent. BC)		822 p. 330 Leone	32
FGrHist 334 F 77	31A		

Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica The Sources, Text and Translation 323

PAUSANIAS ATTICISTA (2nd cent. AD)		fr. 127 Snell-Mähler	[58]
Ὀνομάτων συναγωγή			
o 32.1-6 Erbse	41	PLATO (5th-4th cent. BC)	
		<i>Leges</i>	
PAUSANIAS PERIEGETES (2nd cent. AD)		624a	14
<i>Graeciae descriptio</i>		632d	14
9.23.2	34A	<i>Minos</i>	
		319a	14
PETRONIUS ARBITER (1st cent. AD)		<i>Phaedrus</i>	
<i>Satyricon</i>		243b	32
2.4	30	<i>Symposium</i>	
		223c	[56]
PHILOCHORUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)			
<i>FGrHist</i> 328 F 210	15	PLATO COMICUS (5th-4th cent. BC)	
<i>FGrHist</i> 328 F 211	15	<i>PCG</i> F 138 K.-A.	45
PHILOSTRATUS, FLAVIUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)		PLINIUS SECUNDUS (1st cent. AD)	
<i>Vita Apollonii</i>		<i>Naturalis Historia</i>	
6.11	32	7.86	[59]
PHILOSTRATUS IUNIOR (2nd-3rd cent. AD)		PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (1st-2nd cent. AD)	
<i>Imagines</i>		<i>De exilio</i>	
2.12	34A	13.604d	[64a]
		<i>De Herodoti malignitate</i>	
PHOCYLIDES (6th cent. BC)		39.871a-b	35
T 10 Gentili-Prato	30	<i>De proficientibus in virtute</i>	
		7.79b	[63]
PHOTIUS (9th cent. AD)		<i>Quaestiones Convivales</i>	
<i>Bibliotheca</i>		1.5.1.622e	[62], 43A
101b4	[63]	7.10.2.715d	43A
<i>Lexicon</i>		8.9.3.732f	44
λ 292 Theodoridis	35	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
s.v. Οὐδέν - Διόνυσον,		fr. 130 Sandbach	43A
p. 35 ll. 2-9 Nab.	41	fr. 130 Sandbach	[62]
PHRYNICHUS COMICUS (6th-5th cent. BC)		[PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS]	
<i>PCG</i> F 78 K.-A.	31A	<i>De Musica</i>	
		3.1132, p. 3 Ziegler	30
PINDARUS (6th-5th cent. BC)		<i>De proverbii alexandrinorum</i>	
<i>Isthmia</i>		30, p. 15 Crusius	41
2.6-9 Snell	36	<i>Vitae decem oratorum</i>	
<i>Olympia</i>		841b (Lycurgus)	49
13.1 Snell	35	848d (Hyperides)	49
<i>Fragmenta</i>		<i>De Homeri vita et poësi</i>	
fr. 122 Snell-Maehler	35	2-3	15

324 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

POLEMON (2nd cent. BC)		Ξ 470 Erbse	18
<i>FHG</i> fr. 9 v. 3.117	49	Σ 285 Erbse [A]	18
		Σ 378b Erbse	22A
PSELLUS, MICHAEL (11th cent. AD)		Φ 390a Erbse	20
Ἑρμηνεῖται εἰς κοινολεξίας		Ψ 454 van Thiel [D]	22A
5	[63]	<i>in Homeri Odysseam</i>	
		€ 334 Dindorf	24A
QUINTILIANUS (1st cent. AD)		κ 136 Dindorf	24A
<i>Institutio oratoria</i>		<i>in Lycophronis Alexandram</i>	
5.11.20	48	822, p. 164 Leone	32
10.1.62	30	<i>in Pindari Olympia</i>	
10.1.66	8	10.17, v. 1, pp. 313-314	
11.2.11	[59]	Drachmann	14
		13.32b, v. 1, pp. 364-365	
SAPPHO (7th-6th cent. BC)		Drachmann	35
T 203a-b Voigt	29	<i>in Pindari Isthmia</i>	
T 252 Voigt	29	ad 2.9a, v. 3, p. 214 Drachmann	36
T 253-264 Voigt	29	<i>in Platonis Philebum</i>	
T 11 Gallavotti ²	29	29 Cufalo	3A
SCHOLIA		SENECA (1st cent. AD)	
<i>in Aeschyli Prometheus vinctum</i>		<i>Epistulae</i>	
175 Herington	[63]	122.2	9
<i>in Aristidis Orationes</i>			
1.212	32	SERVIUS (4th cent. AD)	
46.162.89	31A	<i>in Vergili Aeneidem Commentarii</i>	
<i>in Aristophanis Acharnenses</i>		6.805	17
10	8		
850a	39	SEXTUS EMPIRICUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)	
<i>in Aristophanis Aves</i>		<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>	
807a	48	2.20	38
807b	48		
<i>in Aristophanis Pacem</i>		SIMONIDES (6th-5th cent. BC)	
697	36	<i>Epigr. FGE</i> 14 Page	35
967	36	T 21 Poltera	38
<i>in Aristophanis Nubes</i>		T 39a Poltera	36, [59]
966a Koster [Tzetzes]	31A	T 39b Poltera	[59]
967a Koster [Th.-Tricl.]	31A	T 68a-b Poltera	36
967a-c Koster [an. rec.]	31A	T 74d Poltera	[51]
967a Koster [Tzetzes]	31A	T 75-77 Poltera	36
<i>in Euripidis Orestem</i>		T 76b Poltera	36
249	32	T 74 Poltera	36
<i>in Homeri Iliadem</i>		T 80 Poltera	[59]
Z 133 van Thiel [D]	17	T 81 Poltera	[59]
Z 518b Erbse	21A	T 82 Poltera	[59]
H 230 Erbse	19	T 84 Poltera	[59]
K 37 Erbse	21a	T 94 Poltera	36

Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica The Sources, Text and Translation 325

T 107 Poltera	36	τ 597 Adl. s.v. Τιμάσιος	9
T 108 Poltera	37	υ 294 Adl. s.v. Ὑπερίδης	49
F 2 Poltera	36		
fr. 26 West ²	36	THEAGENES RHEGINUS (6th cent. BC)	
fr. 69 Diehl ²	37	72 A 1 D.-K.	15
fr. 70 Diehl ²	37		
SOPHOCLES (5th cent. BC)		THEON, AELIUS (1st cent. AD)	
TrGF T 1.22 Radt	44	Progymnasmata περὶ μύθου	
TrGF T 52a Radt	43A	173, p. 31.12-20 Patillon	48
TrGF T 52b Radt	43B	THEOPHRASTUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
TrGF F 448 (app.) Radt	[58]	fr. 1 FHS&G	49
		fr. 551 FHS&G	9, [53]
SOPHRON (5th cent. BC)		fr. 575 FHS&G	10
PCG F 59 K.-A.	1A		
		THEOPOMPUS (4th cent. BC)	
STESICHORUS (7th-6th cent. BC)		FGrHist 115 F 285a	35
TB1 Davies	30		
TB23(i)(a) Davies	[58]	TIMAEUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
fr. 200 Davies	[58]	FGrHist 566 F 10	35
PMG 193 Page	32	FGrHist 566 F 9	9
STESIMBROTUS THASIOS (5th cent. BC)		TZETZES, IOANNES (12th cent. AD)	
FGrHist 107 F 21	15	Historiae	
		1.685-686 p. 31 Leone	31A
STOBAEUS (5th cent. AD)			
Anthologium		VITA AESCHYLI	
3.18.32 Wachsmuth-Hense	43A	12, p. 35 Radt	8
3.34.1 Wachsmuth-Hense	3A		
		XENOPHANES (6th-5th cent. BC)	
STRABO (1st cent. BC - 1st cent. AD)		21 B 21 D.-K.	[51]
Geographica			
15.1.7-8	17	ZENOBIUS (2nd cent. AD)	
		1.64, p. 356 Miller	39
SUDA LEXICON (10th cent. AD)		cent. 2, 16, v. 1, p. 35 L.-S.	40A
α 1289.26 Adl. s.v. Ἀλκμάν	27	cent. 5.40, v. 1, p. 137 L.-S.	41
α 1982 Adl. s.v. Ἀναξανδρίδης	46		
θ 282 Adl. s.v. Θέσπις	41	ZENODOTUS EPHESIUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
σ 107 Adl. s.v. Σαπφώ	29	p. 54 Duentzer	15
σ 439 Adl. s.v. Σιμωνίδης	[59]		
σ 440 Adl. s.v. Σιμωνίδης	36, [59]	[ZONARAS]	
σ 1095 Adl. s.v. Στησίχορος	32	Lexicon	
σ 1271 Adl. s.v. Συβαριτικάῖς	9	1307 Tittmann	35

INDEX OF NAMES

Acamas	32	Chalcis	37
Achilles	21A, [58]	Chilon	3A, 3B, 3C, 52
Aeschylus	8, 42, 43A, 43B, 44, [58], [59], [60]	Chorinthiae	35
Agarista	9	Chorinti	35
Agesilaus	[53]	Chorinthus	35
Alcaeus	13, [54], [57]	Clearchus	3A
Alcibiades	47	Cleis	29
Alcman	26, 27, 57	Cleomenes	11
Alyattes	28	Clinias Pythagoricus	5
Anacreon	28, 39, [58]	Clisthenes	9
Ananius	[53]	Crates comicus	[57]
Anaxandrides	46	Crates Mallotes	15
Antimachus Colophonius	15	Critias	[58]
Aphrodisius	1a	Croesus	28
Aphrodita	27, 35	Cybissus Lybicus	48
Apollo	14, 37	Cyces	39
Apollodorus Atheniensis	15	Cyclops	10, 40A, 40B, 40C, 40D
Archilochus	28, 30	Cydoniatae	[58]
Archytas	27, [58]	Cyrus	28
Ares	[60]		
Argonautae	23	Delphi	3A, 14
Aristarchus	15, 18	Demophon	32
Aristias	40A, 40B, 40C, 40D	Didymus	[52]
Aristides	[53]	Dionysius Olynthius	15
Aristodemus	17	Dionysius tragicus	3A
Aristophanes Byzantius	15, 24A, 24B	Dionysus	17, 37, 41, 47, [54], [61], 2
Aristophanes comicus	31B, 44, 45, [56]	Diphilus	28
Aristoteles	3B, 14, 24A, 24B, [52]	Dori	1a
Artemon	39, [50]		
Athena	14, 31A, 47	Eperatus	3A
Athenae	46	Ephorus	15
Athenienses	4, 47, 54	Epicharmus	[57]
Atridae	37	Eratosthenes	15, 31A, 31B
		Erigyus	29
Bromius	[58]	Eros	27, 28, [58]
Byzantii	1a	Euripides	3A, [57]
		Eurypyla	39, [60]
Callias	4	Gigantomachia	47
Calchedonii	1a	Glossographi	22A
Callistratus	15	Gorgias	[62]
Cambyses	15	Graecia	10, 35
Camirus	47	Graeci	4, 9, 10, 35

Chamaeleon of Heraclea Pontica The Sources, Text and Translation 327

Hegemon	47	Metroon	47
Helena	32	Mido	31A, 31B
Helicon	34A-C	Mimnermus	30
Heracles	1a	Mithridates	1a
Heracleotae	1a, 4	Mnesitheus Atheniensis	[54]
Heraclides	16	Musa, -ae	27, 28, [58]
Hermesianax	28	Mytilenae	29
Hermippus	3A, 3C		
Herodotus	11, 15	Nysa	17
Hesiodus	16, 30, 32, [52]		
Homerus	[52]	Odysseus	10, 40A
Hieron	36	Olympia	35
Hipponax	28	Oraculum delphicum	12
Hipponicus	4		
Homerus	10, 15, 16, 30, 32	Patroclus	21A, [58]
Hyperides	49	Persae	35
Hypomnematastae	22B	Perses	35
		Philochorus Atheniensis	15
Iason	43a	Phocylides	30
Ibycus	[58]	Phrynichus	31A, 31B
Idmon	23	Phrygia	1a
Indi	17	Phryges	44
India	17	Pindarus	35, 34B, [58]
Iopes	32	Plato	14, 45, 49
Iphicles	32	Polemon	49
Isthmus	35	Polycrates	28
Ister	34B, 34C	Polydamas	18
Iulis	37, 63	Polyphemus	40A
Iuppiter	14, 20	Pontus	1a, 4
		Priamus	19, 44
Labys	3A	Proteus	32
Lacedaemon	3A, 11	Pythia	[54]
Lacedaemones	4, 38	Pytho	3A
Lacones	11		
Lamprocles	31A, 31B	Sappho	28, 29
Larichus	29	Sardanapalus	[53]
Lasus Hermioneus	33	Scamandronymus	29
Leoprepes	[59]	Scamandrus	29
Lesbius, -a	29	Scythae	11
Lesbus	28	Seleucus	1a
Locrenses	14, 54	Sicilia	47
Lycurgus	14	Simonides	35, 36, 37, [51], [59]
Lycurgus orator	49	Smindyrides	9, [56]
		Sodamus Tegeates	3A
Megaclides	15	Sophocles	43A, 43B, [58]
Megalostrata	27, [57]		

328 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Stesichorus	31A, 31B, 32, 37, [58]	Theseus	32
Stesimbrotus Thasius	15	Thestor	23
Syracusae	36	Troia	32, [53]
Thales	3A, 3B, 3C, [52]	Xenophon Corinthius	35
Theagenes Rheginus	15		
Thebani	4	Zaleucus	14, [55]
Theophrastus	8, 9, 49, [53]	Zenodotus	15, 18
Theopompus	35		

CONCORDANCE

1 D. Giordano, *Chamaeleontis Heracleotae fragmenta*, iteratis curis commentarioque instruxit, Bologna 1990²

Giordano	Martano	Giordano	Martano
1	1a	33	36
2a	3B	34	37
2b	3C	35	38
2c	3A	36	39
3	4	37a	40A
4	5	37b	40B
5	6	37c	40C
6	7	37d	40D
7	8	38	41
8	9	39	42
9	10	40a	43A
10	11	40b	43B
11	12	41	44
12	13	42	45
13	14	43	46
14	15	44	47
15	23	45	48
16	18	46	49
17	19	47	16=1b=25
18	20		
19a	21A	Martano	Giordano
19b	21B	1a	1
20a	22A	1b=16=25	47
20b	22B	1c-f	—
21a	24A	2	—
21b	24B	3A	2c
22	17	3B	2a
23	26	3C	2b
24	27	4	3
25	28	5	4
26	29	6	5
27	30	7	6
28a-b	31A	8	7
28c	31B	9	8
29	32	10	9
30	33	11	10
31	35	12	11
32a	34B	13	12
32b	34C	14	13
32c	34A	15	14

330 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Martano	Giordano	Martano	Giordano
16=1b=25	47	40A	37a
17	22	40B	37b
18	16	40C	37c
19	17	40D	37d
20	18	41	38
21A	19a	42	39
21B	19b	43A	40a
22A	20a	43B	40b
22B	20b	44	41
23	15	45	42
24A	21a	46	43
24B	21b	47	44
25=1b=16	47	48	45
26	23	49	46
27	24	[50]	—
28	25	[51]	—
29	26	[52]	—
30	27	[53]	—
31A	28a-b	[54]	—
31B	28c	[55]	—
32	29	[56]	—
33	30	[57]	—
35	31	[58]	—
34A	32c	[59]	—
34B	32a	[60]	—
34C	32b	[61]	—
36	33	[62]	—
37	34	[63]	—
38	35	[64A-C]	—
39	36		

2 F. Wehrli, *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes, (Die Schule des Aristoteles, Band IX)*, Basel-Stuttgart 1969²

Wehrli	Martano	Wehrli	Martano
1	1a	7	8
2a	3B	8	9
2b	3C	9	10
2c	3A	10	11
3	4	11	12
4	5	12	13
5	7	13	14
6	6	14	15

Wehrli	Martano	Martano	Wehrli
15	23	2	–
16	18	3A	2c
17	19	3B	2a
18	20	3C	2b
19	21A	4	3
20	22A	5	4
21a	24A	7	5
21b	24B	6	6
22	17	8	7
23	25=1b=16	9	8
24	26	10	9
25	27	11	10
26	28	12	11
27	29	13	12
28	30	14	13
29a-b	31B	15	14
29c	31A	16=1b=25	23=46
29	32	17	22
30	33	18	16
31	35	19	17
32a	34B	20	18
32b	34C	21A	19
33	36	21B	–
34	37	22A	20
35	38	22B	–
36	39	23	15
37a	40A	24A	21a
37b	40B	24B	21b
37c	40C	25=1b=16	23=46
38	41	26	24
39	42	27	25
40a	43A	28	26
40b	43B	29	27
41	44	30	28
42	45	31A	29c
43	46	31B	29 a-b
44	47	32	29
45	49	33	30
46	1b=16=25	35	31
		34A	–
		34B	32a
		34C	32b
Martano	Wehrli	36	33
1a	1	37	34
1b=16=25	46	38	35
1c-f	–		

332 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Martano	Wehrli	Martano	Wehrli
39	36	[50]	—
40A	37a	[51]	—
40B	37b	[52]	—
40C	37c	[53]	—
40D	—	[54]	—
41	38	[55]	—
42	39	[56]	—
43A	40a	[57]	—
43B	40b	[58]	—
44	41	[59]	—
45	42	[60]	—
46	43	[61]	—
47	44	[62]	—
48	—	[63]	—
49	45	[64A-C]	—

3 V. Steffen, *Chamaeleontis Fragmenta*, edidit et illustravit V. Steffen, Varsoviae 1964.

Steffen	Martano	Steffen	Martano
<i>praef.</i> p. 8	1a	22	25=16=1b
1	3B-C	23	26
2	4	24	27
3	5	25	28
4	7	26	29
5	6	27	30
6	8	28	31A-B
7	9	29	39
8	10	30	33
9	11	31	36
10	12	32	37
11	13	33	38
12	14	34	35
13	15	35	34B-C
14	23	36	40A-B-C
15	18	37	41
16	19	38	42
17	20	39	43A-B
18	21A	40	44
19	22A	41	45
20	24A-B	42	46
20	24B	43	47
21	17	44	49

Steffen	Martano	Martano	Steffen
45	1b-16-25	31A	28
p. 55	[53]	31B	28
		32	—
		33	30
		35	34
Martano	Steffen	34A	—
1a	<i>praef.</i> p. 8	34B	35
1b=16=25	22=45	34C	35
1c-f	—	36	31
2	—	37	32
3A	—	38	33
3B	1	39	29
3C	1	40A	36
4	2	40B	36
5	3	40C	36
6	5	40D	—
7	4	41	37
8	6	42	38
9	7	43A	39
10	8	43B	39
11	9	44	40
12	10	45	41
13	11	46	42
14	12	47	43
15	13	48	—
16=1b=25	22=45	49	44
17	21	[50]	—
18	15	[51]	—
19	16	[52]	—
20	17	[53]	—
21A	18	[54]	—
21B	—	[55]	—
22A	19	[56]	—
22B	—	[57]	p. 55
23	14	[58]	—
24A	20	[59]	—
24B	20	[60]	—
25=1b=16	45	[61]	—
26	23	[62]	—
27	24	[63]	—
28	25	[64A-C]	—
29	26		
30	27		

334 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

4 G. Scorza, *Il peripatetico Cameleonte*, “RIGI” 18 (1934), pp. 1-48

Scorza	Martano	Scorza	Martano
<i>praef.</i> pp. 1-2	1a	37	8
p. 3	15	38	3B-C
1	20	39	12
2	18	40	49
3	19	41	1b=16=25
4	21A	42	6
adn. 1 p. 6	21B	43	7
5	22A	p. 22	[59]
6	23	p. 37	[55]
7	17		
8	24A		
adn. 3 p. 6	24B	Martano	Scorza
9	26	1a	<i>praef.</i> pp. 1-2
10	27	1b=16=25	41
11	30	1c-f	—
12	31A	2	—
13	28	3A	—
14	29	3B	38
15	39	3C	38
16	37	4	30
17	36	5	31
18	38	6	42
19	33	7	43
20	35	8	37
21	34B-C	9	36
22	46	10	35
[23]	47	11	34
24	45	12	39
25	40A-B-C	13	33
26	41	14	32
27	44	15	p. 3
28	43A	16=1b=25	41
29	42	17	7
30	4	18	2
31	5	19	3
32	14	20	1
33	13	21A	4
34	11	21B	adn. 1 p. 6
35	10	22A	5
36	9	22B	—

Martano	Scorza	Martano	Scorza
23	6	41	26
24A	8	42	29
24B	adn. 3 p. 6	43A	28
25=1b=16	41	43B	28
26	9	44	27
27	10	45	24
28	13	46	22
29	14	47	23
30	11	48	—
31A	12	49	40
31B	-	[50]	—
32	—	[51]	—
33	19	[52]	—
35	20	[53]	—
34A	—	[54]	—
34B	21	[55]	p. 37
34C	21	[56]	—
36	17	[57]	—
37	16	[58]	—
38	18	[59]	p. 22
39	15	[60]	—
40A	25	[61]	—
40B	25	[62]	—
40C	25	[63]	—
40D	—	[64A-C]	—

5 E. Koepke, *De Chamaeleontis Heracleotae vita librorumque reli-
quiis disputavit, quaestiones de ratione, quam in enarrandis poetis
secutus esset Peripateticus*, Berolini 1856

Koepke	Martano	Koepke	Martano
<i>praef.</i> p. 4	1a	11	39
<i>praef.</i> p. 15	15	12	33
1	24A	13	37
2	18	14	36
3	19	15	38
4	21A	16	35
5	22A	17	46
6	23	18	47
7	17	19	40A-B-C
8=38	1b=16=25	20	41
9	30	21	44
10	28	22	43A-B

336 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Koepke	Martano	Martano	Koepke
23	42	22A	5
24	26	22B	—
25	4	23	6
26	5	24A	1
27	27	24B	—
28	45	25=1b=16	8=38
29	14	26	24
30	13	27	27
31	11	28	10
32	10	29	—
33	9	30	9
34	[53]	31A	—
35	8	31B	—
36	3B-C	32	—
37	49	33	12
38=8	1b=16=25	35	16
		34A	—
		34B	—
		34C	—
Martano	Koepke	36	14
1a	<i>praef.</i> p. 4	37	13
1b=16=25	8=38	38	15
1c-f	—	39	11
2	—	40A	19
3A	—	40B	19
3B	36	40C	19
3C	36	40D	—
4	25	41	20
5	26	42	23
6	—	43A	22
7	—	43B	22
8	35	44	21
9	33	45	28
10	32	46	17
11	31	47	18
12	—	48	—
13	30	49	37
14	29	[50]	—
15	<i>praef.</i> p. 15	[51]	—
16=1b=25	8=38	[52]	—
17	7	[53]	34
18	2	[54]	—
19	3	[55]	—
20	—	[56]	—
21A	4	[57]	—
21B	—		

Martano	Koepke	Martano	Koepke
[58]	—	[62]	—
[59]	—	[63]	—
[60]	—	[64A-C]	—
[61]	—		

6 *Corpus dei Papiri filosofici greci e latini. Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina. Parte I: Autori noti*, vol. 1*, Firenze 1989, pp. 403-418, ed. F. Montanari.

Montanari	Martano	Martano	Montanari
1T	3A.32-34	3A.32-34	1T
2T	34A	29.28-32	3T
3T	29.28-32	31A	5T
4T	32.1-13	32.1-13	4T
5T	31A	34A	2T



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

3

The Peripatos on Literature Interpretation, Use and Abuse¹

Franco Montanari

I have been asked to make some opening remarks for this conference that forms part of the well-known and important “Theophrastus Project” and I will just try to draw an outline, offering a few examples and making some general considerations concerning “the Peripatos on Literature.” This is, I believe, a subject worthy of new and deeper investigation and reflection, because the scrappy and scanty evidence makes it rather difficult to perceive its overall significance and content.

So what I have aimed to do for this occasion is to cast a retrospective glance at the series of “Theophrastus Project” conferences held starting from 1981, a task which is greatly facilitated thanks to the website² and of course through consultation of the published books. These materials constitute an impressive collection of scientific results, gathered together in over a quarter of a century. If I have counted correctly, the conference devoted to Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes (in 2007) was the 14th meeting of the “Theophrastus Project”;³ and now the 15th meeting, on Aristoxenus, has already been held at DePauw University (Indiana,

¹ English Translation by Rachel Barritt Costa.

² http://www.ucl.ac.uk/GrandLat/research/research-projects/theophrastus_extras/conf

³ Swiss Institute and British School at Rome, Rome, Italy, 5-7 September 2007.

USA) on September 2009. The beginning of the project saw attention focusing on the Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics, with regard to the work of Arius Didymus (1981); thereafter, Theophrastus was the theme most widely addressed (1983, 1985, 1989, 1993 and 1999), interspersed with Cicero (1987) and Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle (1991).

In 1995 the conference held in Boulder (Colorado) on Demetrius of Phalerum and Dicaearchus of Messene inaugurated a line of research which is the aspect that ideally leads us to this meeting on Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes. This line can be described as the study of the intellectual figures of the Peripatos who were pupils of Aristotle and Theophrastus and who can be dated to a period of time referring roughly to the second half of the 4th and 3rd century. The focus of this research is a renewed investigation into the possibility of reconstructing their personality, their work and their interests on the basis of a new edition and through reconsideration of the extant fragments. In addition to Theophrastus, attention has already dwelt on Heraclides of Pontus, Demetrius of Phalerum, Dicaearchus, Eudemos of Rhodes, Strato of Lampsacus (2005, not yet published), Lyco, Hieronymus of Rhodes, Aristo of Ceos; and subsequently, on Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes, and Aristoxenus of Tarentum (see above). Over the next few years we can probably expect Clearchus of Soli, Phaenias of Eresus and perhaps others as well, such as Critolaus of Phaselis.

The themes addressed by the activity of this group of figures are very numerous and range over the most disparate fields of knowledge. Personally, during the course of my studies I have never dealt with ancient philosophy *stricto sensu*, and I have devoted attention to the majestic figure of Aristotle only as regards a particular sphere of his investigations, namely his work on language and on man's use of language for the creation of works of literature in a general sense, from oratory to poetic genres. Substantially, this means that I have dealt with two works that have come down to us, the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*, and a few lost works, such as the *Homeric Problems* or the *On Poets*. More precisely, I would say that I have dealt with Aristotle's reflection on poetic art as such, on its history, on the personality of the authors and on the interpretation of the works. The same kind of inquiry also underlies my interest in the school of Aristotle and the Peripatetic intellectuals, who form the object of the "Theophrastus Project." This is why I took part in the above mentioned conference held in Boulder in 1995 on Demetrius of Phalerum and Dicaearchus: my subject was

“Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature.”⁴ I would now like to build on a few aspects of that research and try to offer a few reflections that link it to the present context. From the scrappy and scanty evidence of a few fragments concerning Homer there emerged several results that seemed noteworthy, at least from my point of view. For example, I think it is rather interesting that, as far as one can tell, Demetrius reflected on the narrative plot of the *Odyssey* and its *telos*, following in the footsteps of Aristotle (in the *Poetics*) but to some extent adopting positions of his own (fr. 145 SOD = 193 Wehrli): we will come back to this topic below.

What I want to go back to now is the fragment in Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 5.177 e-f (fr. 143 SOD = 190 Wehrli), which concerns *Iliad* 2.409. The subject it deals with occurs in the context of a discussion on the *symposia* and above all on who should be invited to attend. Athenaeus says that Homer also gives indications as to which persons do not require any invitation but instead come to a feast on their own initiative. An example is given from the chieftain’s dinner arranged by Agamemnon in *Iliad* book 2: Homer says that Menelaus came *autómatos*, of his own accord (2.408). Athenaeus comments (177 c): “For it is plain that neither a brother, nor parents, nor wife need be invited, nor anyone else whom one holds in equal esteem with these: otherwise it would be cold and unfriendly. And yet some authorities have added a verse which further explains the reason: ‘for he [*scil.* Menelaus] knew in his heart that his brother was troubled’ [v. 409] — as though it were necessary to tell the reason why a brother might come to dinner of his own accord....” After a prolonged explanation of the absurdity of adding l. 409 to introduce a non-existent motivation, Athenaeus continues with an illustration of the opinions of the grammarian Athenocles of Cyzicus and those of Demetrius of Phalerum: “Demetrius of Phalerum declared that the inclusion of the verse ‘for he knew in his heart that his brother was troubled [*scil.* v. 409]’ is awkward and foreign to the poet’s style, and imputes meanness to the characters. ‘For’, says he [*scil.* Demetrius], ‘I think that every man of refinement has someone, either relative or friend, to whom he can go when a feast is on without waiting for an invitation’.”⁵ It appears that this specific problem of internal consistency of the Ho-

⁴ Montanari (2000).

⁵ Transl. by Gulick (1928). Athenaeus then goes on to discuss the passage from the *Symposium* where Plato (*Smp.* 174 b) also mentions *Iliad* 2.407 ff., with a disquisition as to whether or not it was suitable for Homer to present Menelaus as going *autómatos* to Agamemnon’s dinner, claiming that Menelaus ranked below Agamemnon.

meric passage was indeed a subject of discussion among Alexandrian philologists: Aristarchus interpreted the text in such a manner as to save the line, while others underlined the inconsistency and opted in favour of athetizing it. Demetrius of Phalerum is the most ancient authority known to have noticed these contradictory elements and to have believed the line to be spurious. It is likely that we have the remains of a *zétēma* in genuine Peripatetic style, possibly on rules and customs in *symposia*, in which interpretation of the Homeric text also led naturally to debate on an issue of coherence. It seems not altogether unrealistic to suggest that this kind of Homeric criticism stimulated debate in Alexandrian intellectual circles: Demetrius of Phalerum's observation on the passage of *Iliad* 2 may actually have given rise to a proposal of a Zenodotean *obelós*.

The idea of considerations on rules and customs in *symposia* may have had a fitting place in the context of a treatise, whatever form the treatise may have had, concerning themes of behavioral ethics in the sphere of political social life, the family, or relations among individuals. It was quite natural to make reference to authoritative texts of the *paideia* sanctioned by the cultural tradition, first and foremost Homer. I would suggest that, seen in this light, the small fragment of Demetrius takes on considerable significance, especially if one reflects on the various routes that might cause observations springing from different contexts to prompt meditation on more strictly philological problems, and thus, as it were, to migrate and be transported under the Alexandrian sky (as Demetrius himself did).

At that time my attention was also attracted by a fragment of Dicaearchus and now I would like to take the opportunity to re-examine it. *Sch. Od.* 1.332 preserves, presumably by means of an *excerptum* from Porphyry, an intriguing comment by Dicaearchus on the passage from the *Odyssey* in which Penelope makes her first appearance (fr. 95 Mirhady = 92 Wehrli). While the banquet of the suitors is in full swing at Odysseus's palace, from her rooms on the upper floors Penelope hears the song of the bard Phemios and goes down into the hall, accompanied by two handmaidens.

ἡ δ' ὅτε δὴ μνηστῆρας ἀφίκετο διὰ γυναικῶν,	332
στῇ ῥα παρὰ σταθμὸν τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο,	
ἄντα παρειάων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα·	
ἀμφίπολος δ' ἄρα οἱ κεδνὴ ἐκατέρθε παρέστη.	335

When Penelope, queen among women, had reached the suitors, she stood by the pillar that held the strong-built roof, holding her shining veil across her cheeks, and a loyal maid stood on either side of her.⁶

Sch. Od. 1.332 a. ἡ δ' ὅτε μνηστῆρας κτλ.] αἰτιᾶται ἐκ τῶν ἐπῶν τούτων Δικαίαρχος [fr. 95 Mirhady] τὴν παρ' Ὀμήρῳ Πηνελόπην ... οὐδαμῶς γὰρ εὐτακτον εἶναί φησι τὴν Πηνελόπην, πρῶτα μὲν ὅτι πρὸς μεθύοντας αὕτη παραγίνεται νεανίσκους, ἔπειτα τῷ κρήδεμνῳ τὰ κάλλιστα μέρη τοῦ πρωσόπου καλύψασα τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μόνους ἀπολέλοιπε θεωρεῖσθαι. περίεργος γὰρ ἡ τοιαύτη σχηματοποιία καὶ προσποίητος, ἥ τε παράστασις τῶν θεραπαινίδων ἐκάτερθεν εἰς τὸ κατ' ἐξοχὴν φαίνεσθαι καλὴν οὐκ ἀνεπιτήδευτον δείκνυσι. φαμέν οὖν ὅτι τὸ καθόλου ἔθος ἀγνοεῖν ἔοικεν ὁ Δικαίαρχος. σύνηθες γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τὰς ἐλευθέρας γυναῖκας εἰς τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν εἰσιέναι συμπόσια. μαρτυρία δὲ...⁷

From these words Dicaearchus found fault with the Penelope in Homer ... He says that Penelope is by no means well-behaved, first because she comes into the presence of drunken young men, then because she covers the most beautiful parts of her face with the veil, allowing only her eyes to be seen. For such posturing is superfluous and pretentious, and the accompanying of the women servants on each side for the purpose of appearing outstandingly beautiful shows it was not unintended. However we say that Dicaearchus seems to be ignorant of the general custom. For it was common among the ancients that the free women entered the men's symposia.⁸

Dicaearchus's critical observation on Penelope's behavior is rebutted by pointing out that he has not taken into account the common custom according to which it was usual among the ancients for free women to take part in men's *symposia*. As proof of this (μαρτυρία δὲ..., in the continuation of the sch., omitted above), mention is made of the Odyssean parallels of Arete and Helen, who are present, respectively, during the banquets at Alcinous's palace among the Phaeacians (*Od.* 7 and 8) and at Menelaus's royal palace in Sparta (*Od.* 4). Then, citing words by Nausicaa in *Od.* 6.287-288, it is stated that being in the company of males and taking part in male gatherings is improper for young girls, but not for married women. Thus Penelope has done nothing wrong by intervening personally to interrupt Phemios's song on the sorrowful return of the Greeks from Troy, especially since the ancients

⁶ Transl. by Martin Hammond.

⁷ Pontani (2007) 171-173.

⁸ Transl. by Mirhady (2001) 95-97.

believed that it was appropriate for a free woman, even if she was the daughter of a king, to devote herself personally to various tasks and activities. Therefore, her intervention is not out of place: rather, it shows *sophrosyne*,⁹ reminding the suitors how hateful their courtship is, given that the memory of her husband cannot be erased from her mind. There follow observations on the suitors' behavior and then a long disquisition on the *kredemnon* (the veil) and on the gesture of covering the face made by various Homeric characters, particularly on occasions when tears are shed. The passage closes with two notes concerning the handmaidens who accompany Penelope: firstly, this too is a normal custom for the ancients, and thus cannot be interpreted as a malicious exhibition; moreover, these are devoted and wise handmaidens, not two of the treacherous and impudent ones mentioned in *Od.* 22.424, a fact that helps to shed light on the attitude of Penelope herself.

Thus we have a long *excerptum*, which draws its inspiration from the passage in which Penelope makes her appearance: then, starting from an observation by Dicaearchus, a commentary is provided, debating in various ways on the “customs of the ancients” (*archaioi, palaioi*) with regard to the social behavior of women. The theme is examined from an extensively ethical perspective, but the “documentation,” so to speak, is entirely derived from Homer (*Odyssey* and *Iliad*), with citation of various passages to support the arguments put forward concerning the lines from Book 1 and in connection with the appearance of Odysseus's spouse on the scene of the poem. It is clearly a stimulating passage of the *Odyssey*, on the subject of which Dicaearchus had at the very least advanced two considerations: Penelope does not show proper behavior when she appears among drunken men in the very middle of a *symposium*; the gesture of covering only a part of her face with the veil, leaving her eyes uncovered, and the fact of having two handmaidens at her side demonstrates a deliberately precious affected form of behavior, designed to highlight her own person. It is natural to assume that the attention is drawn by this rather theatrical appearance on the scene, which presents a major character as Odysseus's spouse: perhaps the discussion revolved precisely around the way the poet had constructed this important narrative passage, or alternatively the observation may

⁹ *Sch. Od.* 1.332. 87-88 Pontani (2007): ὥστε ἡ μὲν παρουσία ἐκ τούτων οὐκ ἄτοπος, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωφροσύνην ἐμφαίνουσα.

have belonged to a thematic context of cultural history such as that of the Βίος Ἑλλάδος.¹⁰

It is certainly a coincidence that the first consideration concerns the *symposia*, just as is the case for the above-mentioned fragment of Demetrius of Phalerum, and one must definitely not venture into hazardous connections. Of course, it is striking that later sources interested in Homeric exegesis preserved observations by two intellectuals of the early Peripatos that were so thematically consonant: I mean, not only as regards the theme of the customs of the *symposium*, but more generally as regards the behavioral ethics of archaic society as testified in the Homeric poems. This is indeed a far from secondary theme of the Greek *paideia*, which can also be seen as linked to the well-known sphere of critical reflection on the concepts of *prepon* and *aprepès*. Equally, it is interesting to note that such considerations were by no means ignored and neglected thereafter: on the contrary, they clearly prompted developments and debate in the framework of the rich subsequent Homeric exegesis. We have already seen that this was relevant for Demetrius, but it cannot be overlooked that the treatment preserved by the scholium (from Porphyry) in reply to Dicaearchus is centered on a comparison that is fully internal to Homer, aiming to delineate the Homeric specificity, τὸ Ὀμηρικόν, as laid down by the Alexandrian-Aristarchean method. Moreover, the notion of the historical nature of the moral concepts under discussion that is introduced in the treatment goes in the same direction.

At this point, I cannot disregard another connection, likewise dictated by a fragment of Demetrius of Phalerum: namely, the one concerning the *telos* and the narrative plot of the *Odyssey*, which I mentioned earlier. Stobaeus (3.5.43) preserves a quotation from Hermippus,¹¹ according to whom Demetrius of Phalerum claimed that line *Od.* 23.296 (οἱ μὲν ἔπειτα / ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἴκοντο – “and

¹⁰ Mirhady (2001) classifies the fragment (94-97, nr. 95) under the heading of “Contests, Literary Criticism” and not under that of “Cultural History”.

¹¹ Taken from the work Συναγωγή τῶν καλῶς ἀναφωνηθέντων ἐξ Ὀμήρου: Fr. 92 Wehrli = 1026 F 59 Bollansée (*FGrHist* 4 A 3, with comm.). We know from Diogenes Laertius that Hermippus wrote on Demetrius of Phalerum (Diogenes Laertius 5.78, Demetrius of Phalerum fr. 69 Wehrli = 1, 78 SOD, Hermippus fr. 58 Wehrli = 1026 F 75 Bollansée, with comm.) and it is possible that he lifted Demetrius of Phalerum’s observation on *Od.* 23.296 to include it in a collection of καλῶς ἀναφωνηθέντα taken from Homer.

they [Odysseus and Penelepe] / happily went to the place of their original bed”) had been composed by Homer εἰς σωφροσύνην (fr. 145 SOD = 193 Wehrli: Δημήτριος ὁ Φαλερεὺς εἰς σωφροσύνην ἔλεγε ταῦτα ποιεῖν). But what is the significance of the observation by Demetrius? He asserts that Homer composed the line εἰς σωφροσύνην, which can hardly mean anything other than “for, in view of the, with regard to the *sophrosyne*” (*pudicitiae causa*), or “according to the, in conformity with the *sophrosyne*.” *Od.* 23.296 is the line that ratifies the re-union of Odysseus and Penelope, the end of Odysseus’s wanderings and his return to his family: therefore the *sophrosyne* should reside, I would argue, in Odysseus’s preference for returning home and accepting the love of his legitimate spouse, rejecting the temptations and enticements that lured him during his journeys, as well as in Penelope’s patient wait for her legitimate husband’s return as against all the overtures and gifts from her suitors. All this *sophrosyne* of the adventures of the *Odyssey* is condensed and ratified at the moment when husband and wife finally return to their original bed; and the sch. comments ἀσπαστῶς καὶ ἐπιθυμητικῶς ὑπεμνήσθησαν τοῦ πάλαι τῆς συνουσίας νόμου, “with joy and with desire they revived the memory of the ancient custom of being together.” One may also wonder whether, by drawing attention to the passage and speaking of *sophrosyne*, Demetrius intended to refer to that of the character or that of the poet himself in creating the characters and their story with this ending. In any case, neither option in any way affects the basic fact, namely that Demetrius placed emphasis on this line on account of its value in relation to the meaning and moral value of the issue.

The information that Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus had indicated the *telos* or *peras* of the *Odyssey* as residing in *Od.* 23.296 has given rise to great debate in modern criticism concerning the meaning to be attributed to this observation. Not a word about this question here: suffice it to say that there is likelihood that Demetrius of Phalerum’s focus on *Od.* 23.296 represented an early stand on the significance of this point of the poem. The actual verse itself does not seem to offer profound teaching as regards *sophrosyne*, but it acquires much greater depth of meaning if it is seen in context in the sense described above. Aristotle had given an exemplary synopsis of the poem’s main plot in his *Poetics* (ch. 17, 1455b 16-23), indicating that it reached its goal with the suitors’ death and the rest consisted merely of episodes. Thus in Aristotle’s conception the *telos* of the *Odyssey* was achieved with

Odysseus's vengeance and his successful reappropriation of his home and his kingdom. I would suggest it is not unlikely that discussions on the main plot of the *Odyssey* and on the culminating point of a well-rounded narrative continued within Peripatetic circles subsequently to Aristotle's statement, with Demetrius of Phalerum putting forward not exactly the same view, but a slightly different position as compared to that held by Aristotle. Moreover, such a position may have received attention in Alexandria and undergone further discussion among the grammarians. Demetrius' view holds that the real culminating point of the poem, and therefore in some sense the enshrinement of its true meaning, lies in the moment when husband and wife are reunited and in the re-establishment of marital bliss between the protagonist and his faithful wife.

If the first fragment of Demetrius concerned correct behavior in the *symposia*, here we are dealing with comments on Homer involving reflections about the behavior of wedded couples and its social relevance, on the basis of the story of Odysseus and Penelope. It is not far-fetched to cast one's mind back to Dicaearchus's critical observations on Penelope's public behavior at the banquet of the suitors, seen above in the comment on *Od.* 1.332, with the arguments which, however, led to underlining the *sophrosyne* of Penelope: traces of discussions centering around ethical issues, or maybe of divergent opinions concerning Homeric passages and characters, arising in a Peripatetic environment? It is likewise interesting to recall that we have a fragment, in which Aristotle described as *aprepès* the fact that when Odysseus charges into the fray to restrain the routed army that is retreating in disarray after Agamemnon's testing of the morale of the troops, in *Il.* 2.183 he takes off his mantle (*chlaina*) and is left with only his chiton on. Thereby Aristotle evokes the suggestion that the Achean army had been brought to a halt by their amazement at the unseemly gesture of a character such as Odysseus (fr. 143 Rose = 368 Gigon: *Sch. Il.* 2.183 from Porphyry). The source has preserved no fewer than another six possible interpretations (introduced by ἄλλοι δέ and then by a series of οἱ δέ): such a doxography highlights the way this detail was extensively discussed, and shows that Aristotle's remark was by no means isolated. In this particular point of the story Odysseus focuses attention on himself with a highly theatrical gesture, which obtains a spectacular result in an exceedingly striking scene that marks a turning point in the development of the action. The parallel with the case of Penelope commented on by

Dicaearchus is noteworthy: here too discussion centers on an important narrative element, underscoring the way the poet calls attention to the action and accentuates it by attributing to the character a mode of behavior that borders on affectation and is open to criticism due to its unseemliness. The debate addresses the issue of questionable forms of behavior, of seemly or unseemly attitudes displayed by the characters, but one should not overlook that this occurs in relation to places that are important for the narrative plot: this can hardly be a coincidence.

We are thus dealing with a series of ethical considerations (on behavioral rules in the *symposia* and elsewhere, on archaic social and family customs) which build on motifs inspired by comments concerning certain particular Homeric passages. Later exegetic debate would continue to address these issues, but also explore other avenues of enquiry, concerning topics like those we have already seen: the figure of Penelope, Odysseus's manner of acting, the plot and the *telos* of the *Odyssey* and so forth. Particularly interesting from this point of view are the passages whose content was an object of discussion and criticism in the Peripatetic environment, and on which we later find the Alexandrian philologists dwelling in terms of textual problems such as a possible expunction or a choice among variants. Earlier we mentioned *Il.* 2.409; a similar case may be *Il.* 2.319: Aristonicus says the line was expunged, *scil.* by Aristarchus, while Zenodotus retained it, and we know that the passage had been discussed by Aristotle (fr. 145 Rose = 369 Gigon), who seems to cast doubt precisely on this line.¹²

I feel it is helpful, at this point, to recall that a fragment of Aristotle's *Homeric Problems* (*Sch. Od.* 12.129 = fr. 175 Rose = 398 Gigon) shows us the grand master, the founder of the Peripatos, mentioned in connection with a genuinely allegorical interpretation, in a physical-cosmological perspective, of the passage from the *Odyssey* that talks of the cattle of the Sun (*Od.* 12.127-136). *Sch. Od.* 12.129 says that Aristotle φυσικῶς interprets the meaning of the number of cows, seven herds composed of fifty head of cattle apiece, in reference to the days of the lunar year, which number three hundred and fifty, i.e. precisely the product of seven by fifty. It is difficult to say whether the addition present in another sch. to the same verse, according to which the identical number of sheep refers to an equal number of nights, can be traced back to the complete interpretation by Aristotle himself or whether it is

¹² I addressed this case in Montanari (2008).

only a punctilious addition by others (as the formulation would seem to suggest). I believe it is plausible that Aristotle is the source of the entire exegesis and that as far as this passage is concerned he is reporting an interpretation he knew, which must have struck him as worthy of consideration, even though he had not necessarily put it forward himself. There need be absolutely no surprise on finding that Aristotle admits the ancient practice of allegory, in this physical case, as an exegetic possibility to be taken into consideration.¹³ For this too belonged to a consolidated and authoritative tradition, which he contemplates with the historical attitude of the scholar who enquires into precedents and takes into account the reflections put forward before his time, as happens not only for philosophy but also for rhetoric and naturally for poetry itself in famous parts of the *Poetics*.

Aristotle took a novel interest in what we refer to by the overall term of “literature.” In the first place, this accords with his marked and systematic interest in the history of the various disciplines: considerable attention was devoted to erudite research and antiquarian collections, with an effort of historical documentation in the spheres of thought in which Aristotle elaborated a doctrine of his own. The link between the ordered collection of opinions expressed by predecessors (from which doxography drew its origin) and theoretical reflection appears as a characterizing intellectual trait: the scientific foundation of a discipline cannot disregard conscious knowledge of its history, and this holds true for rhetoric and poetics as well. Almost the entire range of available information on the prior *techne rhetorike* is due to Aristotle, even if his collection of *Téchnai* is lost. But special attention should be devoted to everything that can be traced back to research on literature. The *Homeric Problems* and the dialogue *On Poets* have already been mentioned; to these can be added the treatise *On Tragedies*, of which we have only the title. If we cite the collection of *Didascaliae* and the list of Olympic and Pythic winners, their relevance for the works, respectively, of classical drama and choral lyric is unmistakable; the investigations on proverbs certainly had a relation to the poetic texts in which the *paroimiai* are often taken up again; in the *Athenaion Politeia* one notes copious utilization of the political elegy of Solon, and moreover, from a different

¹³ Tulli (1987) 51-52, with other elements in this direction; Pfeiffer (1968) 237, is too cursory: “Plato and Aristotle rejected allegorism, and so consequently did the Academy as well as the Peripatos.”

point of view, the *Constitution of Athens* is likely to have had considerable relevance for the interpretation of allusions and historical references in works such as that of old comedy.¹⁴ The great collection of historical-antiquarian erudition amassed by Aristotle and his school undoubtedly had an organic connection with the sphere of history of literature, with study of the works and reconstruction of the lives of the authors. There was a convergence between literature as a source of information and literature as the object of exegesis and commentaries: the link between erudite documentation and text interpretation was profound and left a fertile training in work and method. This background was then meaningfully continued both in the work of some scholars of the Peripatetic school and also in the critical-exegetic activity of Alexandrian philology, stimulating lively intellectual ferment and an extraordinary thrust.

Together with erudite research on the works and the authors, Aristotle devoted himself to theoretical reflection and constructed a doctrine of his own on the issue of the *techne poietike*: as in other fields of learning, these two aspects could not remain separate. Although the loss of the materials is a serious impediment, one certainly cannot detach the theoretical discourse on epic literature and tragedy conducted in the *Poetics* from the shreds of evidence provided by titles and fragments which hint at study and analysis of questions of various kinds prompted by the texts. In any case even the *Poetics*, despite its speculative theoretical aim, clearly shows that the starting point is observation of reality, its history and its products. Reality, in this context, is the results of the activity of man in the field of poetic art, that is to say concretely the evolution of literary genres from Homer onwards. Without any need for demonstration, Aristotle presupposes straight out that poetry is a *techne*, that it belongs to the range of human activities governed by rationality and is subject to identifiable rules, and that it is distinguished by its own essence and by the aim that is intrinsic to it.

This has been an unquestionable change of perspective. If Plato did not grant poetry a value of knowledge inasmuch as it was imitation of sensible things, for Aristotle poetry generates knowledge in its own right by virtue of being *mimesis* of nature, which is indeed genuine reality: not, however, in the sense that poetry imitates the accidental detail, but rather in that it imitates the universal, because there is no true knowledge unless it be that of the universal (and *mimesis* produces

¹⁴ Montanari (2006).

pleasure because knowledge produces pleasure). Thus, if Plato set the education springing from poetry in opposition to that from philosophy, obviously to the advantage of the latter, for Aristotle poetry belongs to philosophy because it is knowledge of the universal: and this is a decisive positive appraisal. The epistemological plane is unequivocally accompanied by the plane that concerns the end (*telos*) and the effect. In the Aristotelian vision, the value of the products engendered by the art of poetry depends on men's capacities (rather than on divine inspiration) and, further, on accomplishment of the specific end, i.e. knowledge through *mimesis*, more than on the fact of teaching good and appropriate things and educating to the good, in the sense of not conveying harmful messages or indecent content (*condicio sine qua non* for poetry to be accepted). Naturally, for Aristotle, not only is the possibility of an ethical function of poetry by no means excluded: on the contrary, its ethical function is a value to be pursued and achieved in appreciating and interpreting the works of the poets. Yet the essential and specific aim and function of poetry is of a cognitive order in relation to the intellect, and of a psychological-emotive order in relation to pleasure and the passions (as in the case of tragic catharsis). I would argue that one of the most significant passages is to be found in the initial part of Chap. 25, where Aristotle explains that there are two possible mistaken approaches in the art of poetry, the specific mistake that concerns poetics in its own right, and the accidental mistake that concerns any other discipline, such as politics or medicine: if an impossible thing is represented, but the poem achieves its intrinsic aim, then the result is good and positive. Poetic art is a success or a failure in relation to itself and not to any other *techne* or discipline (including history, as stated in another famous passage from [Chap. 9](#), and including political and moral education). Like any other sphere of human activity, poetry has a value of its own, an independent value, and it must be studied and understood with the aid of the appropriate tools. As compared to the idea that poetry should offer righteous moral messages that are valid for society and the state, and teach correct and true things to shape the individual, this novel approach embodied an intellectual change of enormous importance: investigating and explaining the world, the nature and life of men also included investigating and explaining the fundamental texts of men's culture and the sphere of knowledge that concerns literature and poetry.

Aristotle's thought thus cast the consideration of literature in a completely different light. In the global vision of his philosophy, the cultural models and the great poetic creations in which the heritage of the Greek *paideia* was concentrated were a segment of the world, an important portion of the history of civilization and of men, a treasure that was to be studied and known, interpreted, understood. Thus were laid the intellectual foundations that explain not only certain interests and lines of enquiry cherished by the Peripatetics, but also the subsequent long-lasting developments of the great season of Alexandrian philology, which in this respect is the progeny of Aristotle in the most profound sense.

With his reflections, his activity and his teaching, Aristotle brought about a cultural change and molded the Peripatos according to an approach which is clearly recognizable among his pupils, despite the almost total loss of their writings.¹⁵ We can now return to the subject broached in the first part of this paper, examining a few examples of exegesis and comments on some Homeric passages by Aristotle himself, as well as by Demetrius of Phalerum and Dicaearchus. The presentation of *zetemata* on matters of an ethical nature, on the behavior of characters, on habits and customs of various kinds certainly owed a major debt to the traditional themes concerning the end and the educational effect and the moral value of poetry, just as the resumption of allegorical exegesis had roots in a distant past and a well known continuity. The sources that have preserved these fragments clearly reveal that the well defined questions raised in the comments of these Peripatetic figures later became the object of further discussion, with recognizable philological-exegetic developments. There is a distinct perception of standing on the crest of the ridge, in the intellectual phase during which the exegetic intent is making headway and gaining ground as an independent value, also based on a retrospective vision that encompasses awareness and knowledge.

Let us imagine a setting that places us in the last decades of Aristotle's activity, accompanied by the first generation of his pupils. We have already mentioned Demetrius¹⁶ and Dicaearchus. With regard to the latter, we may briefly add that his production in the field of studies on literature included not only Homeric criticism but also writings

¹⁵ Cf. Richardson (1992 and 1994); useful overview with collection of the fragments concerning drama in Bagordo (1998).

¹⁶ Survey of his fragments on literature in Montanari (2000), see above (n. 4).

On Alcaeus, *On Dionysiac Contests*, *On Musical Contests*, as well as a collection of tragic *hypotheses*.¹⁷ Theophrastus's interests in the fields of rhetoric and poetics are well documented, with titles such as *On the Art of Rhetoric*, *Rhetorical Precepts*, *On Style*, *On (the Art of) Poetry*, *On Comedy*.¹⁸ Among the very poor shreds of evidence on Phaenias of Eresus one also finds an *On the Poets*, and among those on Eudemos of Rhodes there is also a *Περὶ λέξεως*. Strato of Lampsacus was generally known as "the physicist" (ὁ φυσικός): literature and the art of poetry do not seem to play a role in his production, but the title *Λύσεις ἀπορουμένων*, *Solutions of difficulties*, may be attractive from our point of view. It is likewise interesting to note that Strato, who was the head of the Peripatos after Theophrastus, spent a period of time in Alexandria at the court of the Ptolemies,¹⁹ as did Demetrius of Phalerum. Unfortunately we are told almost nothing explicitly about their activities and the cultural influence, but this link in the chain cannot be neglected. Heraclides of Pontus, an Academic and associated with Speusippus, did not officially belong to the Peripatos, but his relations with the Aristotelian school have been ascertained and indeed explain some of his specific interests, first and foremost his well documented literary interests. With regard to Heraclides and Strato, we eagerly await the proceedings of the 2005 conference of the Theophrastus Project in Grenoble (Strato: forthcoming as RUSCH XVI) and those of 2003 in Leeds (Heraclides: fragments edited in RUSCH XIV, conference papers forthcoming as Rusch XV).

Aristoxenus is known above all for his theoretical treatises on music. His musicological writings built on the results of previous thinking and became a point of reference: here too the interwoven presence of erudite documentation and theoretical reflection can clearly be perceived. The subject of music was also investigated by Heraclides of Pontus and Dicaearchus; the former wrote a treatise *On Music* and a collection on the most important composers, the latter on musical competitions. A moment's reflection on lyric and drama suffices to realise the connection of music with poetry and the intensity of the link between the two fields of research. But Aristoxenus was also the author of a number of biographies, above all of philosophers (Pythagoras and his follow-

¹⁷ Frr. 1.14, 1.15, 1.17, 1.18, 89-115 Mirhady (2001) 89-115; overview of the problem of the *hypotheses* in Luppe-Montanari (1992); cf. Luppe (2001).

¹⁸ Fr. 666-709 FHS&G.

¹⁹ Cf. Diog. Laert. 5.58-60.

ers, Archytas, Socrates, Plato), but of scholars from other disciplines as well, given that he wrote a *bios* of the dythyrambographer Telestes and a work *On the Tragic Poets*.

We have noted several times that there was considerable interest in literary works and in the personality of the authors. The focus on Aristoxenus prompts us to extend our field of interest to biography, a theme to which another fragment of Demetrius of Phalerum's Homeric criticism can be linked. I mean the fragment provided by the *Sch. Od.* 3.267 (fr. 144 [+146] SOD = 191 [+192] Wehrli) and concerns the famous lines that tell how Agamemnon had entrusted his wife to a bard when he left for Troy.

παρ δ' ἄρ' ἔην καὶ αἰδὼς ἀνὴρ, ᾧ πολλ' ἐπέτελλεν	267
Ἀτρείδης Τροίηνδε κιῶν εἴρυσθαι ἄκοιτιν.	
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μιν μοῖρα θεῶν ἐπέδησε δαμῆναι,	
δὴ τότε τὸν μὲν αἰδὼν ἄγων ἐς νῆσον ἐρήμην	270
κάλλιπεν οἰωνοῖσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι.	

And there was also a bard with her (Clytemnestra), whom the son of Atreus had earnestly charged, as he left for Troy, with the guarding of his wife. But when the time came when the fate of the gods tied her to subjection, then Aigisthos took that bard to a deserted island and left him there to be the prey and food for birds.²⁰

Homer does not tell us the name of the bard and it is only natural that speculation on this matter has been rife. This passage was a subject also addressed by Dicaearchus, who says that “the ancients thought the singer was also wise, as is clear from the one left with Clytemnestra,” but no name is given.²¹ The *excerptum* of Demetrius of Phalerum places the issue in a broader context, which cannot be summarized here:²² he presents a solution to identify the anonymous character and furnishes a few elements of his biography; furthermore, he sets this character in a complex *diadochè* of ancient bards (which also includes Phemios, the bard of the royal palace at Ithaca). The aspect I wish to underline is the

²⁰ Transl. by Martin Hammond.

²¹ Fr. 39 Mirhady = 93 Wehrli, from Phld., *On Music*, 32.21 Kemke. It seems that Aristoxenus also (Fr. 123 Wehrli) touched on the same theme, but I am not sure if the material immediately following the name of Aristoxenus in Strabo 1.2.3 is also to be assigned to Aristoxenus himself: here too no name of the bard is given.

²² Cf. Montanari (2000) 406-410.

general interest in very ancient poets, who preceded Homer, an interest which usually starts out from the singers mentioned in the Homeric poems. This is a type of information found in the *Lives of Homer*, where there is often talk of poets prior to Homer: relations between such poets and Homer are frequently suggested, identifying them as his teachers or in some sense as part of a *diadochè* that included him, or even inserting them into his genealogical tree. The inventions that developed around the bards of the *Odyssey*, and around other figures of minstrels prior to Homer together with the genealogy and teachers of the poet, are quite likely to have sprung up just as gratuitously as the other elements of a biographical tradition that had little to rely on in the way of personal declarations by the author about himself, but which nevertheless exploited as far as possible the information supplied by the poetic text. At a certain point this type of information evidently found suitable channels through which it took shape more concretely: thus a multifaceted biographical tradition began to form.²³

Indeed, Peripatetic research followed this method with remarkable achievements. Reconstructing the life of an author by starting out from an interpretation of passages from his works, discovering real or presumed biographical elements, exploiting – and overexploiting – the texts to this end, is a method which apparently had one of its most fertile applications in the activity of Chamaeleon. The lyrical poets offered rich pickings for this type of work; with others, such as the tragedians, it was certainly more difficult, and Homer no doubt severely tested their speculations. Use and abuse of literature took place copiously.

This brings me to the closing remarks of my paper, and the real beginning of this conference, during which we will listen to in-depth analyses on the above-mentioned figures of Chamaeleon and Praxiphanes. In what remains of their works it can be noted that the study of literature is awarded a much more important and significant place in comparison to the earlier Peripatetics cited so far, even though they were separated by no more than just a few decades. Having metabolized the teachings of Aristotle ever more deeply, the study of literary works and research into the authors was by now a frequently perused field of enquiry and of rewarding investigation.

By the early decades of the 3rd century BCE the term *grammatikòs* appears to have become a specialist term to designate a philologist who

²³ Montanari (1992²) 14-17; Graziosi (2002).

is an exegete of poetry, whereas it previously referred to a teacher at an elementary level. The ancients took note of the change in meaning and raised the question of who had been the first to receive the epithet in its new sense. There was a tradition that pointed to the Peripatetic Praxiphanes, a pupil of Theophrastus: this piece of information can be linked to the conception that regards Aristotle as the initiator of *grammatikè* in the sense of “the erudite study of literature” and as the ideal master and source of inspiration, with his school, of the Alexandrian *grammatikoi*.²⁴ Praxiphanes was roughly a contemporary, probably just slightly older, of Zenodotus of Ephesus, the first librarian of Alexandria.

The attitude of Aristotle and of the first generations of intellectuals in the Peripatos marked a genuine novelty within the Greek cultural framework between the 4th and 3rd century BCE. The surge of interest in literature sprang from the importance attributed by Aristotle to poetic-literary creation as a sphere of human activity. Furthermore, it was profoundly rooted in the attitude of great attention he displayed towards the related historical-cultural themes. The value attached to the personalities and the works representing the consolidated cultural heritage also increased the weight acquired by an intellectual who was capable of interpreting and understanding this highly important heritage. The Peripatetic school and the Alexandrian school were the two avenues opened up by that cultural vision.

Works cited

- Bagordo, A. 1998. *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama mit einer Sammlung der Fragmente* (Stuttgart - Leipzig: Teubner).
- Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 40. 1994. *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, préparés et présidés par Franco Montanari (Vandoeuvres - Genève: Fondation Hardt).
- Fortenbaugh, W.W., Huby, P.M., Sharples, R.W., Gutas, D., eds. 1992. *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence* (Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill).

²⁴ Pfeiffer (1968) 156-159.

- Fortenbaugh, W.W., Schütrumpf, E., eds. 2000. *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion*. RUSCH 9 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- . 2001. *Dicaearchus of Messana. Text, Translation and Discussion*. RUSCH 10 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- Graziosi, B. 2002. *Inventing Homer. The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Gulick, C.B. 1928. *The Deipnosophists I-II* (Heinemann - New York: Putnam).
- Lamberton, R., Keaney, J.J., eds. 1992. *Homer's Ancient Readers. The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* (Princeton: University Press).
- Luppe, W. 2001. "Neues aus Papyrus-Hypothesen zu verlorenen Euripides-Dramen," in Fortenbaugh - Schütrumpf 2001, 329-341.
- Luppe, W., Montanari, F. 1992. "44. Dicaearchus. Hypotheseis dei drammi di Euripide e di Sofocle", in: *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF)*, Parte I: Autori Noti. Vol. 1** (Firenze: Olschki), 32-33.
- Mirhady, D.C. 2001. "Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text and Translation," in Fortenbaugh - Schütrumpf 2001, 1-142.
- Montanari, F. 1992². *Introduzione a Omero* (Firenze: Sansoni).
- . 2000. "Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature," in Fortenbaugh - Schütrumpf 2000, 391-411.
- . 2006. "Aristoteles," in *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP)*, eds. G. Bastianini, M. Haslam, H. Maehler, F. Montanari, C. Roemer, I.1.4, "Aristophanes - Bacchylides" (München - Leipzig: Saur), 241-245.
- . 2008. "Aristotele, Zenodoto, Aristarco e il serpente pietrificato di *Iliade* II 319", in *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli* (Roma: Aracne), 237-244.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Pontani, F., ed. 2007. *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam, vol. I. Scholia ad libros α - β* (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura).
- Richardson, N.J. 1992. *Aristotle's Reading of Homer and its Background*, in Lamberton - Keaney 1992, 30-40.
- . 1994. *Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship*, in *Entretiens* 1994, 7-38.

358 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Stork, P., Ophuijsen, J.M. von, Dorandi, T., (SOD) eds. 2000. “Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text and Translation,” in Fortenbaugh - Schütrumpf 2000, 1-310.

Tulli, M. 1987. “Il giudizio di Platone sull’esegesi allegorica,” in *Interpretazioni antiche e moderne di testi greci. Ricerche di filologia classica III* (Pisa: Giardini), 45-52.

4

Chamaeleon on Pleasure and Drunkenness

William W. Fortenbaugh

Time has not been kind to Chamaeleon. Very little that he wrote has survived, and what has survived is most often more of a tease than a satisfactory report. The fact that he was labeled *Peripatētikos* (Tatianus, *To the Greeks* 31 = Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 10.11.13 = **15**) is some evidence that he attended lectures by Aristotle, but that has not deterred Wehrli from asserting that a proper training within the Peripatos is not a consideration.¹ That judgment seems to me hasty, albeit understandable. Our fragments are indeed few and thin, so that one is inclined to dismiss Chamaeleon as a marginal Peripatetic. Nevertheless, the surviving fragments do not rule out a proper training in the Peripatos. Indeed, I think that the fragments of *On Pleasure* and *On Drunkenness* support the idea that Chamaeleon was very much a contemporary and fellow student of Theophrastus. To be sure, Chamaeleon never achieved the eminence of Theophrastus, and we have no evidence of a course of lectures attributable to him. But that does not mean that Chamaeleon was a failure as a student and in no way a representative of the Peripatetic tradition. Rather, he seems to have embraced the Peripa-

¹ Wehrli (1957) 69: “Da seinen Schriften aber ein eigentlich philosophischer Gehalt gefehlt zu haben scheint, kommt eine wirkliche Schülerhaft nicht in Betracht.”

tetic practice of writing dialogues that dealt with ethical topics much as Theophrastus and other members of the early Peripatos did.

I. On Pleasure

1. The Peripatetic Context

Chamaeleon's name is twice associated with a work entitled *On Pleasure* (8 and 9). No text tells us explicitly what form the work took, but it is reasonable to assume that the work was a dialogue. Aristotle will have led the way. He was a student of Plato when the latter wrote the *Philebus*, a dialogue that acquired the sub-title *On Pleasure*.² Aristotle was involved in the discussion that took place around this dialogue,³ and wrote two works entitled *On Pleasure*. Both are listed in Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Aristotelian works. One was not a dialogue and not primarily ethical. Rather, it was a logical work, in which dialectical propositions, *protaseis*, were collected (5.24).⁴ The other, however, was almost certainly a dialogue. It is found toward the beginning of Diogenes' catalogue among the exoteric works, of which the majority were dialogues (5.22).⁵ No fragment survives,⁶ but we can assume with confidence that the work was ethical in orientation. That Aristotle assigned himself the lead role is a real possibility.⁷ That he recommended moderation and advocated a life that mixes pleasure with knowledge — especially the enjoyment of philosophic activity — is highly likely. That would be in line not only with the Plato's *Philebus* but also with Aristotelian doctrine as set forth in the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

² According to Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 3.57-8, Thrasyllus is responsible for the double title.

³ See Fortenbaugh (1975 = 2002) 9-12.

⁴ Moraux (1951) 36, 93-4.

⁵ Moraux (1951) 27, 36.

⁶ According to Gigon (1987) 300, the absence of a single surviving fragment might be attributable to the fact that the authorship of a work *On Pleasure* was disputed — i.e., it was assigned to both Aristotle and Theophrastus — and that Theophrastus' work *On Pleasure* is cited on several occasions. The explanation strikes me as pure speculation. We hear of disputed authorship in regard to Theophrastus and Chamaeleon, but not in regard to Aristotle. To be sure, Diogenes Laertius records a Theophrastean work *On Pleasure* "like that of Aristotle." But that work, at least as reported by Diogenes Laertius (5.44), is not disputed. See below.

⁷ On Aristotle being the principle speaker, see Cicero, *Letters to Atticus* 13.19.4.

Theophrastus followed the lead of his teacher. He discussed pleasure and did so in at least three different works.⁸ All three are listed in Diogenes' catalogue of Theophrastean works. One was entitled *On False Pleasure* (5.46). It will have taken note *inter alia* of Plato's *Philebus* and what is said therein concerning false pleasure. According to Damascius, Theophrastus rejected the notion of false pleasure (556 FHS&G), and it seems that Aristotle did too.⁹ What we are not told is whether *On False Pleasure* was an esoteric treatise or an exoteric dialogue. Forced to choose, I would say that it was a treatise, but Plato's *Philebus* was a dialogue and the Theophrastean work may have been one as well.

The two other Theophrastean works shared the title *On Pleasure*. In Diogenes' catalogue, they are listed one after the other. The first is distinguished by the descriptive phrase "like that of Aristotle," and the second by "another (work)" (5.44). The phrase "like that of Aristotle" might refer to Aristotle's dialogue *On Pleasure*, but equally it might refer to one of the two accounts of pleasure that are found in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. If the latter is correct, then the work described as "other" will almost certainly have been a dialogue. I prefer the latter possibility, but either way it seems certain that Theophrastus wrote a dialogue whose focus was on pleasure.¹⁰

In the *Sophists at Dinner*, there are four passages, in which Athenaeus connects Theophrastus with a work *On Pleasure*. In two of the passages the connection is made without qualification (12.3 511C-D = 551 FHS&G and 12.31 526D = 549 FHS&G), but in the other two, Athenaeus tells us that the attribution is uncertain. The work is said to be by either Theophrastus or Chamaeleon (6.105 273B-C = 550 FHS&G = **9** and 8.39 347E-F = 553 FHS&G = **8**). In one of these passages, Chamaeleon is mentioned first (**9**); in the other, Theophrastus takes precedence (**8**). In the two cases of

⁸ For discussion, see Fortenbaugh (1984) 118-19.

⁹ Walzer (1929) 203.

¹⁰ For completeness' sake I mention a third possibility: both *On Pleasure* "like that of Aristotle" and *On Pleasure*, "another work" were dialogues. Since Theophrastus will have lectured on pleasure, we might suppose that a portion of his *Ethics* or his *Ethical Lectures* (436 no. 2 and 3 FHS&G) contained an esoteric treatment of the subject, which served as the basis of lectures within the Peripatos. And if that is correct, then the two works that carried the title *On Pleasure* might both be dialogues, one being similar to Aristotle's dialogue *On Pleasure* and the other being different in some significant way. But I am not at all comfortable attributing two dialogues entitled *On Pleasure* to Theophrastus — even if the titles were not assigned by Theophrastus himself. On the assignation of titles, see, e.g., Jacob (2000) 93 and Fortenbaugh (2005) 52-3 and (2011) 126-27.

uncertain authorship, Wehrli decides in favor of Chamaeleon, arguing that he was the lesser known and therefore less likely to have a stray text or roll (one that lacked an identifying tag) assigned to him. Concerning the other two Athenaeus texts, those that mention only Theophrastus, Wehrli comments that they too might derive from Chamaeleon, but he decides against including them within his collection of fragments.¹¹ The latter decision is certainly prudent, and the former is supported by a plausible argument. But there is no certainty here, and it would be a mistake to apply the principle of “the lesser known” in a mechanical/subjective fashion. An example is Theophrastus’ work *To Cassander on Kingship*. It occurs in Diogenes’ catalogue without any indication that the attribution to Theophrastus is disputed (5.47 = 589 no. 12 FHS&G).¹² But in *The Sophists at Dinner*, the work is first attributed to Theophrastus, after which we are told that many people assign the work to Sosibius (4.25 144E-F = 603 FHS&G). For those of us working on Peripatetic philosophy, Sosibius is likely to be the lesser known and therefore the more likely author of the work in question. But that would be a subjective judgment, i.e., it would be based on a limited knowledge of the Hellenistic period. In fact, Sosibius was not little known in antiquity. He was associated with the Alexandrian school, wrote on the history and culture of Sparta and was honored by Callimachus with an epinician poem in elegiac verse.¹³ Moreover, if Sosibius wrote *To Cassander on Kingship*, he will have done so while still a young man. As David Mirhady has remarked, “he (Sosibius) would be writing at most as a twenty-five year-old to a ruler in his fifties. In the case of Theophrastus, however, we can easily imagine him writing to Cassander on his accession (to the throne of Macedonia) in 319 as Aristotle had written an *On Kingship to Alexander* (fr. 646-7 Rose³) on the occasion of his accession.”¹⁴ Returning now to Chamaeleon, we might imagine that he was not as well known

¹¹ Wehrli (1957) 72. Scorza (1934) 41-2 anticipates Wehrli in deciding the cases of uncertain authorship in favor of Chamaeleon. Concerning the other two cases, i.e., those in which Theophrastus alone is named, Scorza accepts the report of Athenaeus: the attribution to Theophrastus alone is correct.

¹² The title *Aristotelian or Theophrastean Memoranda* makes clear that a disputed work may appear in Diogenes’ catalogue and be marked as such: (5.48 = 727 no. 6). That may or may not be relevant to *On Pleasure*, which is not marked in Diogenes’ catalogue as a work of uncertain authorship.

¹³ The testimonia and fragments of Sosibius are collected in *FGrHist* no. 595 (IIB 713-19 Jacoby).

¹⁴ Mirhady (1992) 89-90. Jacob (2000) 99 suggests that there may have been two persons named Sosibius, perhaps grandfather and grandson, of whom the elder was the

in antiquity as Sosibius. But is that correct? He certainly was not unknown: his writings on literary figures seem to have influenced the genre, and his charge of plagiarism against Heraclides was long remembered. Diogenes Laertius reports it at the beginning of the third century AD (5.92 = Heraclides fr. 1 S¹⁵ = 16). I am, therefore, inclined to leave undecided who was in fact the author of the disputed work *On Pleasure*.

The issue becomes more complex when we focus on the fact that Athenaeus' reports are often — I would prefer to say, most often — based on an intermediary. I offer two Theophrastean examples. The first comes from Book 10 where we read what Hieronymus said in his *Epistles*: namely, that according to Theophrastus, Alexander the Great was not in good shape for sexual activity (10.45 435A = 578 FHS&G). Here we have explicit recognition that the report is not taken directly from Theophrastus. The second example is also found in Book 12 and concerns the painter Parrhasius. According to Theophrastus he was able to accept defeat and to work with ease (12.62 543E-F = 552B FHS&G). A fuller account is found in Aelian's *Miscellaneous History* (9.11 = 552A). Similarities are obvious and both are dependent on a common source.¹⁶ To be sure, only Athenaeus refers explicitly to Theophrastus' work, *On Happiness*, but that does not indicate a difference in source. On the contrary, it is an example of Athenaeus' readiness to cite both author and work.¹⁷ What then should we say about the passages in which both Theophrastus and Chamaeleon are mentioned in connection with a work *On Pleasure*? Should we say (guess) that Athenaeus is reporting a judgment based on his own reading of Peripatetic works entitled *On Pleasure*? Or is he reporting what he reads in secondary sources. I am inclined to accept the latter alternative.¹⁸

addressee of Callimachus' poem and the author of *On Kingship*. Other possibilities may suggest themselves, but I leave such speculation to others.

¹⁵ "S" refers to the edition of Schütrumpf *et al.* (2007) [chapter 1](#).

¹⁶ See Fortenbaugh (2011) 59-60.

¹⁷ Concerning Athenaeus' diligence in citation, see Arnott (2000) 41; "When he (Athenaeus) quoted an excerpt, whether of prose or of verse, he was usually precise and methodical in identifying both author and work."

¹⁸ Athenaeus' mode of expression does little to decide the issue. What we read in 8, "as Theophrastus or Chamaeleon stated in the work *On Pleasure*" is compatible both with dependence on secondary sources and with reading and deciding for oneself. Similarly with 9: "the same book is also regarded as that of Theophrastus." (The verb *pheretai* may be translated in various ways: "regarded as," "spoken of," "is in circulation." See LSJ s.v. VIII.) Moreover, we cannot rule out that in one or both these cases, Athenaeus' mode of expression reproduces verbatim or with only slight modification the wording of a secondary source.

If we do accept the use of secondary sources, should we say that Athenaeus is drawing on a single secondary source in which the uncertainty concerning authorship is not only stated but also stated in such a way that it clearly covers all four passages in which Theophrastus is named in regard to a work *On Pleasure*? That is possible: having acknowledged uncertainty in the first two passages, Athenaeus may have chosen not to repeat what he had already said.¹⁹ Perhaps, but the passages are not close together: the first two occur in Books 6 and 8, and the second two in Book 12, so that repetition might be helpful to the reader. Moreover, it is also possible that Athenaeus has reported his source or sources accurately. If he drew on a single source, it may be that the source referred to two different works *On Pleasure*, of which only one was of uncertain authorship and marked as such in Athenaeus' source. If he drew on two different sources, it may be that one source mentioned uncertainty and the other did not, and that both are correct in regard to the material that they report.

A firm conclusion is elusive, so that I satisfy myself with the following modest conclusion. Both Aristotle and Theophrastus wrote dialogues *On Pleasure*. In regard to Theophrastus, that will be true even if all four Athenaeian texts are assigned to Chamaeleon, for Diogenes' catalogue mentions two Theophrastean works *On Pleasure*, of which at least one (and probably only one) will have been a dialogue. In regard to Chamaeleon there is the evidence of Athenaeus. And even if all four of the texts in question should be assigned to Theophrastus, the very fact that Chamaeleon's name is attached to two texts strongly suggests that the latter was known to have written a dialogue *On Pleasure*.²⁰

2. The Fragments

8: This text is found in Book 8 of Athenaeus' *The Sophists Dinner*. The diners have been discussing fish, and Cynulcus²¹ has chosen a fish metaphor to insult Ulpian.²² The latter is said always to pick out little

¹⁹ Cf. Jacob (2000) 100-1.

²⁰ For completeness' sake, I note that Strato, Theophrastus' pupil and third head of the Peripatos, wrote a work *On Pleasure* (Diogenes Laertius 5.59 = fr. 82 no. 8 Sharples [RUSCH 15: 178-9]). No fragment survives.

²¹ "Cynulcus" is the nickname of a Cynic philosopher, Theodorus of Thessaly. On his character and role in *The Sophists at Dinner*, see Wilkins (2000) 24-31.

²² The relation of Athenaeus' Ulpian to the famous Roman jurist and politician Domitius Ulpianus is at best loose. Whereas the latter died a violent death, Athenaeus

fish while passing over the large cuts. He refuses to eat anything appropriate to a man and pays no attention to Aeschylus, who described his own tragedies as “large slices from Homer’s great dinners” (8.39 347D-E). Our text follows immediately. Still thinking of Aeschylus, Cynulcus calls the tragedian a philosopher²³ and tells how on some occasion Aeschylus reacted to unjust defeat. He said that he “dedicated his tragedies to (all) time, knowing that he would acquire the proper honor.” The anecdote is said to be taken from a work *On Pleasure* by either Theophrastus or Chamaeleon (347E-F).

As reported the anecdote is probably a fiction, but if so, it still reflects the fact that Aeschylus was a highly successful playwright, whose fame persisted after his death. Indeed, Aristophanes presents Aeschylus as someone who is conscious of his posthumous fame: “My poetry did not die with me” (*Frogs* 868). And that fame is treated as fact in various places (*Vita* 68 p. 121 W, *Scholia* on Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* 10 and Quintilian, *Oratorical Education* 10.1.66), including the *Suda*, where we read that the son of Aeschylus, Euphorion, won four times with his father’s unpublished plays (s.v. “Euporion,” epsilon 3800 [LG vol. 1.2 78.17-19]).²⁴

According to Wehrli, the connection between the fragment under discussion and the theme of pleasure (i.e., the topic announced in the title *On Pleasure*) might be found in the key word “Ruhm” — i.e., “glory” or “honor,” *timē* in Greek — since pleasure and “Ruhm” are opposed in *The Sophists at Dinner* at 12.3 511C-D. The passage referred to is one in which Theophrastus alone is cited as the author of *On Pleasure*. No one, we are told, calls the life of Aristeides pleasant, but rather that of Smindyrides and Sardanapalus. Yet in regard to reputation — *doxa* — the life of Aristeides is brilliant beyond

has his Ulpian die happily or opportunely (15.33 686C). In *The Sophists at Dinner* Ulpian is presented as a pedantic grammarian. On his character and role, see Wilkins (2000) 24-31

²³ Giordano (1977) 33 translates the Greek *philosophos* with “vate,” in English “bard” or “prophet.” The reason for the translation seems to be what follows: i.e., Aeschylus is said to know that at a later time he will receive due honor. It is, of course, true that knowing what will happen in the future is the mark of a prophet and possibly an inspired bard. But as I understand the text, *philosophos* is best translated with “philosopher,” understood widely to include educated persons who try to behave (and generally succeed in behaving) in a rational manner. Aeschylus’ response, albeit less than modest, fits that description. See below.

²⁴ See Kranz (1933) p. 35 and Wehrli (1957) 72.

comparison (551.1-3 FHS&G). The variation in vocabulary — *doxa* instead of *timē* — is not significant, and Wehrli's suggestion may well be correct. Certainly the early Peripatetics were keenly interested in different life styles and recognized the life devoted to pleasure and the life concerned with honor as traditional candidates for the good life.²⁵ I want, however, to suggest an alternative: namely that **8** is concerned with disappointment including the painful anger that a person is apt to experience when treated unjustly, *adikōs*.²⁶ That a work entitled *On Pleasure* might devote space to pain should be obvious. I mention only that the *Nicomachean Ethics* contains two discussions of pleasure. One is introduced by the phrase “on pleasure” and the other by “on pleasure and pain.” Pain is the proper opposite of pleasure and can be discussed without being mentioned in a title or incipit. Moreover, a life of accomplishment, one that brings great renown, will not be satisfactory if the inevitable disappointments along the way result in painful frustration and even anger, should injustice be involved. An educated person ought to understand that and consider how best to avoid unnecessary pain. Hence, Theophrastus records the painter Parrhasius' response to defeat in a contest concerning Ajax and the arms of Achilles. Parrhasius said with considerable urbanity or charm, *mala asteiōs*, that he cared little about his own defeat, but he sympathized with the son of Telamon, who was once again defeated for the same arms (552A.3-9 FHS&G). Similarly Theophrastus' pupil, Demetrius of Phalerum, when told that the Athenians had taken down his statues, said “But not the merit on account of which they erected these statues (Diogenes Laertius 5.82 = fr. 1.111-13 Stork). Perhaps Theophrastus or Chamaeleon or both saw in Aeschylus a similar ability to handle disappointment.²⁷ The tragedian is called a philosopher not because he concerned himself with logic or metaphysics, but rather because he had his priorities right. Instead of becoming angry at an unjust defeat, he took a long-term view. Indeed, he may even have taken pleasure in the thought of due recognition at a later time.

It might be objected that the preceding interpretation harmonizes poorly with what we read elsewhere: namely, that Aeschylus was defeated in a competition by the young Sophocles (presumably in 468

²⁵ See, e.g., Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.5 1095b14-1096a4.

²⁶ That anger is a painful response to unjust, unfair, undeserved treatment is standard Peripatetic doctrine. See Aristotle's *Rhetoric* 2.2 1378a30-2.

²⁷ Cf. Scorza (1934) 43.

BC). Aeschylus became upset with the Athenians and departed for Syracuse, where Hiero was tyrant (*Life* 43 p. 121 W). Here we have the response of an overly proud individual, and such an individual is what we meet in **8**. Instead of responding in a graceful manner as did Parthasius, Aeschylus responded with a boast: his plays are “for (all) time” and will receive due recognition. Both texts portray Aeschylus in an unattractive light, so that it makes no sense to force a favorable interpretation on **8**.²⁸ This argument is not foolish, but I am not convinced. I offer three reflections. First, one and the same kind of occasion, i.e., a defeat, can give rise to quite different anecdotes. A tradition hostile to Aeschylus will see in a defeat the occasion for an unflattering response. In contrast, a tradition favorable to the poet will see the occasion for a flattering response.²⁹ Second, it is not at all clear that describing one’s tragedies as “dedicated to (all) time” is an unseemly boast. We may compare Demetrius’ claim that the Athenians had failed to remove the merit on account of which his statues had been erected. Both may strike us as egotistical, but a fourth century Greek may have seen these claims as clear-headed and true.³⁰ Third, the description of Aeschylus as being “one of those who are most philosophical,” *philosophos* ... *tōn panu*, seems to call for a favorable interpretation.

9: This text is taken from Book 6 of Athenaeus’ *The Sophists at Dinner*. The subject under discussion is slavery. Masurius³¹ has spoken of the large number of slaves held by the Corinthians, Athenians and Aegin-

²⁸ We might compare fr. **46**, in which Athenaeus cites the sixth book of Chamaeleon’s work *On Comedy*. There the Peripatetic reported how the comic poet Anaxandrides reacted to defeat: instead of revising an unsuccessful comedy, he had the text destroyed. That Chamaeleon viewed Anaxandrides’ behavior negatively is not in doubt. He tells us that the poet was bitter in character and angry at the audience on account of old age.

²⁹ Just as one kind of event can be “spun” in different ways, i.e., favorable and unfavorable, so the same set of words can be used in opposite ways. See below on “seeing neither the sunrise nor the sunset.”

³⁰ David Mirhady has called my attention to Thucydides, *Histories* 1.22, where the historian characterizes his own work as a possession “for ever.” The explicit reference to the future may be compared with Aeschylus’ reference to “(all) time.” Only here there is no disappointment that motivates the historian as there is in the responses of Aeschylus and Demetrius.

³¹ A person named Masurius Sabinus lived in the time of the Emperor Tiberius (*Pauly’s RE*, Zweite Reihe, erster Band [1920] col. 1600-1), but the Masurius of *The Sophists at Dinner* is not to be identified with him.

etans (6.101-3 271B-272D), and Larensius³² has called attention to the large number held by individual Romans. Larensius has also taken note of slave rebellions and singled out Scipio Africanus and Julius Caesar as Romans who exhibited moderation in regard to slaves. We are told that when they traveled abroad they took along five and three slaves, respectively (6.104-5 272D-273B). At this point our text begins. Scipio and Caesar are contrasted with Smindyrides of Sybaris, who is reported to have been accompanied by a thousand servants when he went to the wedding of Cleisthenes' daughter, Agariste. Explicit mention is made of fishermen, fowlers, and cooks. The reason for such a large entourage is stated clearly: delicacy and luxury. After that Larensius refers to a work *On Pleasure*, whose authorship is uncertain: it is attributed to both Chamaeleon and Theophrastus. On the basis of this work, Larensius reports a boast of Smindyrides: In twenty years he had not seen the sun either rise or set. The boast was intended to show how happily Smindyrides was living. Larensius then closes his remarks on Smindyrides with an explanation: Smindyrides used to go to bed early in the morning (before sunrise) and to wake up late (after sunset), and in both cases he was wretched.

How much of this text should we attribute to Chamaeleon or Theophrastus, and how much to Athenaeus? As I read the text, only Smindyrides' boast (not to have seen the sun rise or set) and the immediately preceding statement of intention (wishing to show how happily he was living) are explicitly referred to the disputed author of *On Pleasure*.³³ Nevertheless, we can say that the subsequent remark (not seeing the sunrise or sunset was considered wonderful in regard to happiness) agrees with the preceding statement of intention and therefore represents the thinking of the disputed author, if not his words. More problematic is the closing remark with its value judgment (being wretched). The remark may have been found in *On Pleasure*, but equally (and in my judgment, more probably) the explanation is an addition that Athenaeus has put in the mouth of Larensius.

The opening report concerning the number of slaves taken by Smindyrides to the wedding of Agariste occurs elsewhere: Herodotus 6.127 and Diodorus Siculus 8.19. We also find it repeated later in

³² Larensius is the host of the dinner. His real name is Publius Livius Larensis. He was a pontifex minor, whose wife honored him after his death with an altar on which was inscribed "maritus incomparabilis!" See Braund (2000).

³³ The phrase ὥς ἱστορεῖ is both backward and forward looking.

The Sophists at Dinner 12.58 541B-C. It was a well-known illustration of luxurious living, which a reader might expect to find repeated in a work entitled *On Pleasure*. But expectations can be disappointed. In any case, the reference to fishermen, fowlers and cooks is perhaps best regarded as an addition by Athenaeus. That is the judgment of Christopher Pelling,³⁴ who points out that when Athenaeus returns to the wedding of Agariste in Book 12, Herodotus is cited and what the historian says in *Histories* 6.127 is quoted verbatim. After that comes an abbreviated version of the sentence concerning fishermen, fowlers and cooks found in **9**. Fishermen are omitted. If we did not have Herodotus' *Histories*, we would think that he was responsible for the sentence. But we do have the *Histories* and can see that the sentence is not Herodotean. It has been tacked on by Athenaeus. Presumably he did not invent the idea that fowlers, cooks and other servants accompanied Smindyrides, but where it originated and from where Athenaeus has it cannot be determined. None of this proves that the work *On Pleasure* failed to mention the wedding of Agariste. In antiquity, Smindyrides was a paradigm of the life devoted to pleasure — in the *Eudemian Ethics* Aristotle mentions him alongside Sardanapallus as a representative of the life devoted to enjoyment (1.5 1216a16-19)³⁵ — and an entourage of one thousand servants almost cries out for inclusion. But that said, it is well to recall that in **9** the reference to *On Pleasure* is made only in regard to Smindyrides' boast concerning sunrise and sunset and his intention to show how happily he was living. To apply the reference to the preceding material or some portion of it (omitting the thousand fishermen, fowlers and cooks) is speculation.

The idea that someone sees neither the sunrise nor sunset has its own appeal, so that we should not be surprised to find it applied to persons other than Smindyrides. In Book 12 of *The Sophists at Dinner*, it is used in regard to the people of Colophon. They are said to have become so dissolute through heavy drinking, that some of them never see the sun rise or set (12.31 526B). It is also applied to the Sybarites (Smindyrides' fellow citizens). Their city was located in a hollow and was extremely hot at mid-day during the summer months. As a result, most of the inhabitants thought that drinking bouts would be good for their health. And in time it came to be said that any Sybarite who wished to avoid

³⁴ Pelling (2000).

³⁵ Cf. Theophrastus fr. 551 FHS&G.

370 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

an early death must see neither the sun rise nor the sun set (12.18 519F-520A). In Book 6 immediately after the report concerning Smindyrides, we are told that Hestiaeus of Pontus boasted that he had never seen the sun rise or set, because he was always engaged in study. The boast is characterized as noble (6.105 273D), and that may be a correct assessment in the case of Hestiaeus, but it is worth noting that the same set of words could be used to mock a scholar who is so lost in his work that he has no life other than his research. He arises toward noon after studying late into the night; he quickly retreats to his study and does not come out until after midnight. He is a lost soul who never sees the sun rise or set. Be that as it may, the idea of never seeing the sunrise or sunset has wide application. Smindyrides may have said of himself that for twenty years he had not seen the sun rise or set, but it is equally possible and perhaps probable that someone else put these words in his mouth. That person need not have been Chamaeleon or Theophrastus. One or both of them are likely to be reporting an established tradition.

When we consider the content of the two texts of disputed authorship and the other two that are assigned to Theophrastus alone, we are confronted with material that is proverbial and anecdotal.³⁶ That encourages the view that a dialogue, especially one concerned with pleasure, is intended to be popular and therefore thin in regard to serious philosophic content. If we add to our considerations Heraclides Ponticus' dialogue *On Pleasure*, the view receives additional support.³⁷ According to Diogenes' Laertius, it was composed in a humorous or comic fashion, *komikōs* (5.88), and the five surviving fragments are all in one way or another popular in content.³⁸ To be sure, Heraclides' credentials as a Peripatetic are quite weak — he is best regarded as an Academic — but

³⁶ Of the two texts that are assigned to Theophrastus alone, 549 FHS&G concerns the proverb "Ionian luxury," and 551 compares Smindyrides and Sardanapulus with Aristides and Ananis with Agesilaus, albeit without any particular anecdote.

³⁷ According to Giordano (1977) 106-7, Heraclides' discussion of pleasure was lacking in scientific rigor. It contained historical-anecdotal material that was marked by polemic, comic coloring and parody.

³⁸ In fr. 39 S, we read about the Athenians wearing purple cloaks and binding up their hair in knots. In fr. 40, Thrasyllus is said to have found insanity most pleasant. In fr. 41, the excessive luxury of the Samians is compared with that of the Sybarites. In fr. 42, we hear of Callias pursuing pleasure, going broke and ending up living with a barbarian hag. In 43, we are treated to Pericles divorcing his wife and taking up with Aspasia, the hetaera from Megara.

he did study with Aristotle in the Academy, hailed from Chamaeleon's home town, and will have had contact with Theophrastus as well as Chamaeleon.³⁹ My concern here is to warn against viewing dialogues that carry the title *On Pleasure* as frivolous throughout. An anecdote may make a serious point, especially in regard to practical ethics. I have already remarked that the example of Aeschylus may be seen as a positive illustration of anger management. Moreover, an anecdote may be an effective way to challenge an important doctrine. For an example, I cite Heraclides, who offered a brief but vivid description of the extraordinary pleasures enjoyed by Thrasyllus, the brother of Crito. As long as he was insane, Thrasyllus viewed all the ships landing in the Piraeus as his own, imagined himself piling up wealth, took great joy in this fantasy and experienced no pain whatsoever. But when Crito took him to a doctor and had his insanity cured, Thrasyllus' life changed. He never again enjoyed the pleasures that he did while insane (Athenaeus 12.81 554E-F = fr. 40 S). The story is fun, but also raises a subtle but forceful challenge to the claim that no one in his right mind would choose a life of pleasure apart from true opinion and knowledge (Plato, *Phil.* 21A-D, 60B-E, 67A; Arist., *NE* 10.2 1172b26-36, 10.3 1174a1-8).⁴⁰ Similarly, Heraclides remarks on the benefits of luxury are instructive. He tells us that tyrants and kings, who have control over all good things and have tried them all, judge pleasure to be the highest good. Moreover, Athenian history makes clear that living in luxury frees the soul and strengthens character. For when the Athenians were victorious at Marathon and single-handedly defeated the power of all Asia, they were living in luxury, wearing purple cloaks, embroidered tunics and golden ornaments (Athenaeus 12.5 512A-D = fr. 39). That is not what we expect to hear, and we need not think that Heraclides is putting forward his considered view. Rather he is using an interlocutor to challenge the standard view that luxury weakens the spirit and over time has disastrous consequences.⁴¹

³⁹ As mentioned above, Chamaeleon accused Heraclides of plagiarism.

⁴⁰ See Wehrli (1969) 79.

⁴¹ Saying that tyrants have tried all good things and deem pleasure foremost (fr. 39) is a direct challenge to Plato's view that the experienced judge is the philosopher (*Republic* 9.8 581E-583A). See Schütrumpf (2009).

II. On Drunkenness

1. The Peripatetic Context

The title *On Drunkenness* is mentioned in connection with several early Peripatetics: Aristotle, Theophrastus, Chamaeleon and Hieronymus. In regard to Aristotle, Athenaeus mentions the title in seven passages, four of which are directly concerned with intoxication: falling backwards as a result of drinking barley-wine (fr. 106 R³), the role of body heat in causing intoxication (fr. 107), and the use of Rhodian pots and spices to make wine less intoxicating (fr. 110 and 111). There is also a passage in Plutarch's *Table Talk* that mentions the title: the speaker expresses surprise that Aristotle may have written that women are less likely to become drunk and yet failed to offer an explanation (fr. 108). To this list, we may add two Athenaeus passages that give no title. One passage recognizes the power of Samagorean wine to make men drunk (fr. 109); the other offers a derivation of the verb *methuein*, "to become drunk" (fr. 102). If our evidence were restricted to these passages, we might conclude that the Aristotelian work was narrowly focused on intoxication. But there are four other passages that give the title *On Drunkenness* and suggest that the work was more inclusive. Two are found in Athenaeus and concern the words *trôgalia* and *tragēmata*, which refer to food served as a dessert (fr. 104, parallel texts). The other two are from Athenaeus and Apollonius, and concern people who remained free of thirst while eating salty food and while crossing the desert (fr. 103, parallel texts).⁴² Our understanding of the Aristotelian work is further complicated by the title *Symposium*. It occurs in Diogenes' catalogue of Aristotelian writings among the exoteric works (5.22) and almost certainly refers to a dialogue.⁴³ Whether the *Symposium* is to be identified with *On Drunkenness* is problematic,⁴⁴ but if it is, then we have further reason to think that *On Drunkenness* was concerned with more than intoxication. For the fragments tell us that Aristotle discussed *inter alia* Homer (fr. 99), arriving clean at a symposium (fr. 100) and offering sacrifices that are complete and whole (fr. 101).

⁴² Fr. 105 R³, which does not name a work but mentions the fig and says that it was served up for dessert, might be added, especially in connection with fr. 104.

⁴³ Moraux (1951) 33.

⁴⁴ In their editions of the fragments of Aristotle, Rose and Ross print the fragments together as if the two titles refer to a single work. In contrast Gigon separates the fragments. For brief discussion, see Moraux (1951) 33 and Wehrli (1957) 73.

Theophrastus' work *On Drunkenness* is likely to have been a dialogue, in which he played a lead role.⁴⁵ That is strongly suggested by a passage in which Athenaeus quotes Theophrastus: "At least, Theophrastus in the (work) *On Drunkenness* says, 'I hear (*punthanomai*) that even Euripides poured wine at Athens for the so-called Dancers.'" (10.24 424E-F = fr. 576 FHS&G). In the fragments that refer by title to *On Drunkenness*, various topics are addressed: the effect of wine on older men (fr. 569), toasts, libations and the kottabus (fr. 570), the use of unmixed wine (572), grape stock (fr. 573), an unusual meaning of the word *zôros* (fr. 574), the vessel called rhyton (fr. 575) and Euripides as a wine-pourer (fr. 576). In other fragments that do not mention the title but are plausibly assigned to *On Drunkenness*, we read of mixing wine with water (fr. 571), conversation at a symposium (1.42-4 and 577A-B), Alexander's weakened sex-drive (fr. 578) and laws regarding women (579A-B), though the last is sometimes assigned to a political work.⁴⁶ The report concerning Euripides as a wine-pourer for the Dancers was also found in Hieronymus' work *On Drunkenness* (fr. 28 W) and is evidence that the works of the early Peripatetics overlapped to some degree in regard to the material discussed. Another topic dealt with by Hieronymus in *On Drunkenness* is the verb *skythizein*, which was explained as "getting drunk" (fr. 29). That may be compared with Chamaeleon's explanation of *episkuthizein* (11) and taken as further evidence of overlap or at least a close relationship between the materials discussed by the Peripatetics. For completeness' sake, I mention the rhyton, which both Chamaeleon and Theophrastus touched upon (9 and fr. 575 FHS&G), and legislation concerning wine (13 and 579A-B).⁴⁷

⁴⁵ For discussion, see Fortenbaugh (1984) 121-3.

⁴⁶ For discussion, see Fortenbaugh (2011) 734-37.

⁴⁷ Although scholars disagree about both the amount of Theophrastean material contained in 579A-B and the source of that material — Does it derive from a political work or from *On Drunkenness*? — we can say that nothing rules out a discussion of legislation concerning drinking in Theophrastus' work *On Drunkenness*. Indeed, the fact that Chamaeleon is reported to have discussed the legislation of Zaleucus in his work *On Drunkenness* (14) may speak for attributing the whole of 579A-B to Theophrastus' work *On Drunkenness*. And certainly nothing rules out discussing legislation in more than one place: not only in a political work but also in an ethical work like *On Drunkenness*.

2. The Fragments

10: The text occurs at the beginning of Book 11 of *The Sophists at Dinner*. Ulpian is speaking in anticipation of Plutarch's catalogue of drinking vessels.⁴⁸ He makes a display of learning by commenting on *potēria*, "drinking-cups," and *kylikeion*, "stand-for-drinking-vessels" (11.1-3 459A-460F). After that Ulpian asks whether the ancients drank from large cups. Dicaearchus' work *On Alcaeus* is cited for the view that the ancients used small cups and drank rather watery wine (11.4 460F-461A).⁴⁹ At this point comes our fragment **10**. Ulpian names Chamaeleon and the work *On Drunkenness*. Ulpian adds, "if I remember his words." The Greek has *tēs phōnēs*, which might suggest listening to a lecture, but here *tēs phōnēs* refers to a written text. Should we take the if-clause as a serious caveat? I do not think so. It is part of the dialogue-fiction. Athenaeus will make Ulpian quote Chamaeleon at some length. We are not to imagine a readily available text from which Ulpian reads. On the contrary, he is going to display his memory, to which he calls attention with a disingenuous if-clause.

What is said in the first half of the fragment is not peculiar to Chamaeleon. The idea that persons of power and wealth find their pleasure in wine fits well with the traditional doctrine of three lives: that of pleasure, that of civic involvement and that of philosophy. The life of pleasure was represented by men like Sardanapallus and Smindyrides, who could afford to party all night.⁵⁰ According to Herodotus, Smindyrides boasted that for twenty years he had seen neither the sunrise nor sunset (6.127). The story is repeated by Chamaeleon in the work *On Pleasure* (9).

According to Chamaeleon, large drinking cups became fashionable among powerful men who lacked a pleasure that was more available and finer than that of drinking. But among the ancient Greeks, large cups were not in vogue; rather, they arrived in Greece only recently, being imported from the barbarians, who satisfied themselves with much wine and excessive foods of all kinds (**10**). Here the source of corruption is shifted away from the Greeks to the barbarians. A similar shift can be seen in Herodotus, who tells us that Cleomenes became a heavy drinker through association

⁴⁸ References to the forthcoming catalogue are made at 11.1 460A-B and 11.3 460D. The catalogue itself begins at 11.32 467D and runs to 11.110 504F.

⁴⁹ Fr. 105 M (= Mirhady, RUSCH vol. 10 [2001] 102).

⁵⁰ On Sardanapallus, see Aristotle *NE* 1.5 1095b19-22. On Smindyrides, see above, the commentary on fr. 9 with notes 35-6.

with Scythians (6.84). In his work *On Drunkenness*, Chamaeleon reports the same explanation of Cleomenes' dissolute behavior (11).⁵¹

In the second half of our text, Chamaeleon introduces material evidence. The text is corrupt, but perhaps we can say that Chamaeleon appeals to visual representations. He first says that in earlier times there were no depictions of large cups except for the rhyton,⁵² which was assigned to heroes and no one else. This is said to be puzzling to some, after which an explanation is offered. Since the demigods, i.e., the heroes were regarded as quick to manifest wrath, they were represented as drinking from large cups, in order that they might not seem to be acting in accordance with their character but rather on account of drunkenness. The word for character is *tropos*, which Gulick translates as "inborn character."⁵³ It is not clear to me that the modifier "inborn" is justified, but even if it is, I am not certain what it accomplishes. Individuals, be they heroes or ordinary human beings, who are quarellsome and ready to give blows, *chalepoi* and *plēktai*, are hardly admirable, and that is true whatever their innate character may be. Moreover, if habitual drunkenness is the cause, then they may be viewed as vicious in that their behavior is attributable to intemperance, *akolasia*.

Finally Chamaeleon is reported to have said that those persons are correct who describe the large cup as a *phrear arguoun*, "silver well."⁵⁴ The description is metaphorical and seems to be tacked on all too abruptly.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, it is not irrelevant, for the idea of a "well" suggests great size. In what follows, Ulpian criticizes Chamaeleon by citing Homer and the bowl that was given to the Cyclops by Odysseus (*Od.* 9.346). It must have been a large vessel, for otherwise its contents would not have overcome a person of such great size.

Later in Book 11, toward the end of Plutarch's catalogue of drinking vessels, and within his discussion of the rhyton, we read, "Theophrastus in *On Drunkenness* says that the drinking vessel called the rhyton is assigned to the heroes alone" (11.97 497E = 575 FHS&G). The wording is quite

⁵¹ In regard to the corrupting influence of barbarians, Wehrli (1957) p. 73-4 cites Clearchus fr. 44-9 W. A clear case is fr. 44, where we read that Polycrates the tyrant of Samos came to ruin through emulating the soft life of the Lydians (Athenaeus 12.57 540E-F).

⁵² The rhyton was a vessel that took the form of a horn or an animal's head. See Richter - Milne (1935) 28-9 and Gross (1972) 1426-7.

⁵³ In the Loeb edition, vol. 5 (1933) 11.

⁵⁴ The same judgment occurs at 5.18 192A.

⁵⁵ The abruptness may be due to Athenaeus or his source, who has omitted material.

close to what we find in our Chamaeleon fragment,⁵⁶ and is evidence of overlap.⁵⁷ But should we go further and assert that Chamaeleon has drawn on Theophrastus (the younger on the older), who had already explained the assignation of the rhyton to heroes by reference to their harsh character, which in turn was referred to their heavy drinking? That is possible, but it is also speculation. Moreover, Chamaeleon's explanation for assigning the rhyton to heroes is so weak or odd, that we should resist connecting it with Theophrastus, unless new evidence forces us to do so. Even more should we resist the suggestion that there might have been only one work *On Drunkenness*, which was attributed now to Theophrastus and now to Chamaeleon. A single, all but identical sentence may be striking, but it cannot support the suggestion. And that is true, even if we throw in the fact that on two occasions *On Pleasure* is attributed to both Theophrastus and Chamaeleon (8 and 9).

10: This text occurs in the tenth book of *The Sophists at Dinner*. The speaker is Democritus,⁵⁸ who has been discussing mixing wine with water in varying proportions. We are offered a number of quotations from various authors, after which Democritus cites Anacreon and points out that the poet calls drinking unmixed wine "Scythian." Democritus then cites Herodotus 6.84, who reports what the Spartans say about their king Cleomenes: namely, that through association with Scythians, he became a drinker of unmixed wine and as a result of drunkenness went mad. And the Spartans themselves, whenever they wish to drink stronger wine, use the verb *episkuthizein* (10. 29 427B).⁵⁹ That report is then followed by reference to Chamaeleon, who in his work *On Drunkenness* reported the same material. That is our text **11**,⁶⁰ after which Democritus goes on to cite the playwright Achaëus, who represented satyrs wanting to drink their wine in Scythian fashion.

⁵⁶ Aside from word order and different forms of the same word, the only real difference is that the Theophrastean text includes a word for drinking vessel, *potērion*, which is a difference hardly worth mentioning.

⁵⁷ See above, the end of II.1.

⁵⁸ Athenaeus' Democritus is not to be confused with the famous atomist who was born c. 460 BC at Abdera in Thrace.

⁵⁹ In the Greek verb ἐπισκυθίζειν, the prefix ἐπι may be compared with that in ἐπιχεῖν, to "pour over/in." Hence, LSJ translate "to pour out drink in Scythian fashion."

⁶⁰ Wehrli omits not only the opening lines of **11** (Athenaeus has Democritus refer them to Herodotus) but also the final sentence of **11**. That is odd, for the final sentence concludes the material attributed to Chamaeleon.

Citing both Herodotus and Chamaeleon is repetitive. Both reports tell us that Cleomenes became a heavy drinker by associating with Scythians and both explain the Spartan use of *episkuthizein* by reference to the Scythian practice of drinking unmixed wine. It is noteworthy that the report of what Chamaeleon said in *On Drunkenness* is actually closer to the text of Herodotus than the report concerning Herodotus. The infinitive form *mathein* and the imperative *episkuthison*, both used by Herodotus, are found only in the report attributed to Chamaeleon. Yet that report, as recorded by Democritus, makes no mention of Herodotus. Did Chamaeleon copy the words of Herodotus with some care and fail to mention his source? Or did Athenaeus choose to omit any reference to Chamaeleon's source? Or did Athenaeus have the Chamaeleon report from a secondary source, in which Chamaeleon's source (presumably Herodotus) had been omitted by the compiler of the secondary source?

A fertile imagination will produce other possibilities. Here I add only one more: that of Pelling, who sees in **11** a deliberate distraction. Later in Book 10, Athenaeus intends to include Cleomenes within a list of heavy drinkers who did themselves no good.⁶¹ He will first refer to the earlier mention of Cleomenes as a drinker of unmixed wine (i.e., he will refer to our text **11**) and then add that according to Herodotus Cleomenes slashed himself to death with a knife on account of intoxication (10.48 436E-F). The reference to Herodotus is economical ("Herodotus recorded") and to that extent appropriate to the context, i.e., a list of heavy drinkers. But it is also inaccurate in that Herodotus records three other explanations of the death of Cleomenes: that of most Greeks (Cleomenes used the Pythian priestess to have Demaratus deposed), that of the Athenians (he invaded Eleusis and destroyed the precinct of the gods) and that of the Argives (using deceit he killed the Argives who had taken refuge in the temple of Argus).⁶² Moreover, Herodotus states clearly that he prefers the first of these alternative explanations: Cleomenes had Demaratus deposed.⁶³ If the reader had in mind what

⁶¹ In the lines that immediately precede, we read of Charidemus, whose drinking led to sexual missteps, and of Arcadion and Erasixenus, both of whom drank themselves to death. We also read about Alcetas and Diotimus. They are described as heavy drinkers. Their death is not mentioned, but in the case of Diotimus we are told that he drank unceasingly through a funnel. Dire consequences are easy to imagine. Thereafter comes Cleomenes.

⁶² *Histories* 6.75.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 6.84

Herodotus actually said about Cleomens, he would find the later account of Cleomenes' death and the unqualified reference to Herodotus as overly simplified and unfair to the historian. For this reason the earlier citation of Herodotus is kept to a bare minimum and Chamaeleon is added, for the reader "might attach more weight to Chamaeleon, the treasure-trove as he clearly was of such hedonistic material. That is where you went for material like this."⁶⁴ This explanation has its appeal, but I have misgivings. For if the goal were "to distract attention from the detail of exactly what Herodotus says" about Cleomenes, that goal might be better served by omitting altogether the earlier reference to Herodotus. Chamaeleon *qua* treasure-trove would be enough. Moreover, the earlier passage makes no mention of Cleomenes' death, neither in the report of what Herodotus says nor in that concerning Chamaeleon. Both reports tell us only that Cleomenes went mad as a result of heavy drinking. It is only in the later passage that the reader is confronted with Cleomenes' death and with the statement that according to Herodotus intoxication caused Cleomenes to mutilate himself. That is certainly an incomplete and to that extent unfair report of what Herodotus actually says. The alert reader will notice that, but he may not care. For he knows that Athenaeus is adapting his material to the given context, i.e., to a list of persons whose excessive drinking had unwanted consequences. Athenaeus includes Cleomenes in the list, and in doing so, he selects Herodotean material that suits his purpose. And he does so with commendable brevity: shorter is better; i.e., less detail, more punch.

Whatever the truth concerning Athenaeus' intentions, I think that we can say the following about Chamaeleon. He was no stranger to the *Histories* of Herodotus, and all most certainly he will have been familiar with the three alternative explanations set forth therein. He will also have recognized that these explanations would command attention in a variety of contexts. But in a work *On Drunkenness*, there is no compelling reason to mention them. There the effects of drunkenness, barbarian excesses and the Spartan use of *episkuthizein* are topics that interest the reader.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Pelling (2000) 186-7.

⁶⁵ We should not be surprised that Hieronymus of Rhodes, in his work *On Drunkenness*, made use of *skuthizein*, which he regarded as synonymous with "getting drunk." Ἱερώνυμος δ' ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης καὶ τὸ μεθύσαι σκυθίσαι φησί (Athenaeus 11.101 499F = fr. 29 White, RUSCH 12 [2004] 152). See Giordano (1977) 113-14, who also comments on *apuskuthizein* and *ekskuthizein*.

12: This text occurs in Book 1 of the *Sophists at Dinner*.⁶⁶ In what precedes, there is a detailed discussion of dancing (1.39 21D-1.40 22D). Next reference is made to the satirist Timon of Phlius. He is said to have spoken of the Museum in Alexandria and of the philosophers who wrangled there while being fed like prize fowl in a coop (1.41 22D). After that comes our text. At the outset, there is a lacuna of uncertain length. In what does survive, we read of table-orators who suffer from verbal diarrhea. They are said to have sore tongues and to be forgetful of the Pythian oracle that Chamaeleon records: “Twenty days before the Dog(-star) rises and twenty days afterwards, use Dionysus as (your) doctor within the shadows of (your) house.” What follows is closely related. According to Mnesitheus of Athens, the Pythian priestess told the Athenians to honor Dionysus as a doctor. After that come two quotations from Alcaeus, both of which urge drinking wine when the Dog-star is rising. There follows a similar quotation from Eupolis, and finally several lines from Antiphanes that begin by identifying life with drinking (1.41 22E-23A).

The citation of Timon of Phlius introduces a new topic: the subject changes from dancers (21D-22D) to philosophers in Alexandria (22D). The material associated with Chamaeleon (22E) seems to involve another shift in topic. To be sure, the table-orators are similar to Timon’s well-fed philosophers in that they enjoy eating and talk incessantly, but in regard to the latter there is no reference to wine. Such a reference first occurs, albeit implicitly, in the oracle recorded by Chamaeleon: Dionysus *qua* doctor is understood to prescribe wine during the dog-days of summer.⁶⁷ Mnesitheus, too, makes reference to Dionysus, after which the verses of Alcaeus include an explicit mention of wine. It seems reasonable, therefore, to recognize a shift in topic, and to think that the shift was marked in the lacuna by a change of speaker. Casaubon has suggested that Cynulcus takes over and shifts the focus to wine.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Book 1, along with Book 2 and the beginning of 3, has been preserved for us by an epitomator, who reduced the original text to a series of excerpts that are often disjointed.

⁶⁷ Cf. Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 5.30, where the Cynic philosopher Oenomaos of Gadara interprets the words of the god not as a prophecy but as a medical prescription intended to relieve the Athenians who were oppressed by the summer heat. See Giordano (1977) 114.

⁶⁸ I. Casaubon ap. Schweighaeuser (1801) 180.

Chamaeleon is explicitly named in connection with the oracle that follows: he is said to record it (*hon anagraphei*). It is tempting to believe that Chamaeleon is also the source of the immediately preceding material: i.e., he did speak of “verbal diarrhea,” “table-orators” and “sore-tongue.” One might go even further and suggest that behind “verbal diarrhea” and “sore tongue” lurks a physiological theory involving black bile⁶⁹ and that Chamaeleon illustrated drinking wine during the dog-days by reference to, e.g., the Sybarites, whose city was so hot in summer that they sought health in drinking bouts.⁷⁰ But making such connections, however interesting, would be pure speculation. Moreover and more importantly, the word “table-orators” may be construed in terms of the banquet that Athenaeus has created. The table-orators are the diners, whose blather has irritated Cynulcus, who is eager to discuss wine. If that is the case, and I think it is, then fragment **12** tells us little. We learn only that Chamaeleon reported two verses that are attributed to the oracle at Delphi.

Finally, we should take note of the fact that while our text only names Chamaeleon, it refers to no specific work. Wehrli, Giordano and Martano opt for *On Drunkenness*, and I agree with them. Verses that prescribe drinking would be entirely at home in a work on drunkenness, and no other work seems to be a strong candidate. Nevertheless, Scorza prefers *On Aeschylus*. He thinks that Chamaeleon expressed a negative view of heavy drinking in *On Drunkenness*, and that text **12** would better fit a work that focused on the poet Aeschylus.⁷¹ To be sure, in *The Sophists at Dinner* only a half page before **12**, we read that according to Chamaeleon, Aeschylus wrote his tragedies while drunk. And that text is regularly assigned to *On Aeschylus* (1.39 22A = **43B**).⁷² But in the absence of more context, it is impossible to say how Chamaeleon used **12**, wherever it may have occurred. Indeed, it may have occurred in a context that recommended drinking in certain situations without endorsing heavy drinking throughout the year on all occasions. Moreover, **12** contains no reference to Aeschylus, let alone the work *On Aeschylus*. To imagine such a reference is to indulge one’s fantasy to no purpose.

⁶⁹ Cf. ps.-Aristotle, *Problems* 30.1 954a34

⁷⁰ Athenaeus 12.18 519F-520A.

⁷¹ Scorza (1934) 43-4.

⁷² Cf. Athenaeus 10.33 428F = **43A**, where a similar report concerning the drinking of Aeschylus occurs and *On Aeschylus* is referred to by title.

13: This text is found in the tenth book of *The Sophists at Dinner* some two and one half pages after text **11**. Democritus is still the speaker. He has discussed *inter alia* certain ancient practices including libations to the gods, called attention to the bad behavior for which drunkenness is responsible, commented on the drinking habits of various poets,⁷³ and taken note of what Aristotle says about physiology and intoxication (10.30 427C-10.34 429F). After pausing to take a drink, Democritus again⁷⁴ focuses on mixing wine with water (10.35 429F). He quotes the poet Alcaeus and proceeds to criticize Chamaeleon's interpretation of the quoted words. That is our text **13**.

The words are ἐγχεε κέρναις ἓνα καὶ δύο. According to Democritus, certain persons (*tines*) including Chamaeleon regarded Alcaeus as a temperate individual. Hence, they construed these words in a way that suits such a person: Alcaeus calls for only one or two cups of unmixed wine (cf. 10.35 430C).⁷⁵ Democritus refutes this interpretation by citing various verses of the poet that are said to show that Alcaeus drank at all times and in all circumstances.⁷⁶ We are even treated to the injunction: "Plant no other tree in preference to the vine" (430C). Finally, Democritus, following the grammarian Seleucus, cites the poem itself, i.e., the poem of which the quotation is only a small part. It is clear that the words "one and two" refer to the proportion of water to wine⁷⁷ and that there is no idea of limiting the number of cups to one or two. On the contrary, we read, "Let one cup thrust away the other" (430C-D).

Our Athenaeon text refers to no particular work by Chamaeleon. We know that he wrote works on individual poets, so that we might be tempted to view text **13** as a fragment of a monograph on Alcaeus. But it seems wrong to create a work that is nowhere attested in order to accommodate a single text. Moreover, Giovanna Scorza has argued that had Chamaeleon

⁷³ Regarding Aeschylus, see the preceding note.

⁷⁴ Democrates first discussed mixing wine and water at 426C-427C.

⁷⁵ Pace Scorza (1934) p. 38, there is no strong reason to delete ἄκρατον. To be sure, drinking unmixed wine might be viewed as a mark of intemperance or a first step in that direction (see below on fr. **14**, on the legislation of Zaleucus), but here the emphasis is on limiting one's drinking to a very few cups. We may compare the Scotsman who finishes off his meal with a shot or two of single malt whiskey. He may be a *bon vivant*, but he is not necessarily intemperate in his use of alcohol.

⁷⁶ Earlier at 10.33 429A, Democritus had paired Alcaeus with Aristophanes as poets who composed their work while intoxicated.

⁷⁷ I.e., one part water to two of wine. As D. L. Page (1955) 308 observes, the first number regularly refers to the water and the second to the wine.

written a monograph on Alcaeus, the requisite survey of the poet's drinking songs would have ruled out the interpretation that is attributed to him, i.e., one that is compatible with the moderate drinking of a temperate individual. For that reason, Scorza has suggested that text **13** should be regarded as a fragment of *On Drunkenness*.⁷⁸ That is most likely correct, but a caveat may be in order. For it is not true that all poets who celebrate heavy drinking are necessarily intemperate. Biographers may make a practice of deducing a poet's character from his poems, but exceptions need to be recognized. I cite Athenaeus, who has Democritus say that Anacreon made all his poetry depend on drinking, but he himself was sober when he wrote, and a good man who merely pretended to be intoxicated (10.33 429B). Perhaps Chamaeleon held a similar view of Alcaeus. He recognized that Alcaeus celebrated drinking in his poems, and yet believed that the poet was not himself a heavy drinker. But if that is the case, it is hard to understand why Chamaeleon was moved to offer such a wrong-headed interpretation of the words "one and two." He might have acknowledged that they are appropriate to heavy drinking and yet maintained that Alcaeus himself was not given to excess.

One final possibility: Perhaps Athenaeus has his report from a secondary source that was less than accurate. The wrong-headed interpretation was assigned to certain persons (*tines*) including Chamaeleon. The source may or may not have named the other persons, but Athenaeus was attracted by the name "Chamaeleon," for whom no work was cited. I do not want to deny that there was a work of Chamaeleon in which the wrong-headed interpretation was advanced, but I am tempted to ask whether the attribution might be confused. It is at least possible that the interpretation was advanced in a dialogue by an interlocutor only to be refuted perhaps by Chamaeleon himself. The distinction between a view set out by Chamaeleon and one accepted by him became lost in an intermediary, so that Athenaeus accepted the erroneous interpretation as that of Chamaeleon.⁷⁹ But I am speculating.

14: We have here a text taken from Clement of Alexandria. In his *Patchwork*, Clement, a Christian author, lists three traditional pagan lawgivers, who are said to have turned to three different gods for guid-

⁷⁸ Scorza (1934) 38-9, following Koepke (1856) 40.

⁷⁹ Cf. Heraclides challenging the view that luxury weakens the spirit. Almost certainly his challenge was set forth in order to be refuted. See above, the end of Section 1.

ance in legislation. First, Minos, the legendary king of Crete, is reported to have gone to the cave of Zeus every nine years in order to receive laws from the god.⁸⁰ Second, Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, is said to have traveled to Delphi on a regular basis in order to be instructed in legislation by Apollo. Plato, Aristotle and Ephorus are named as sources, but no particular works are cited.⁸¹ Third, Zaleucus, the reputed lawgiver of the Locrians, is said to have acquired laws from Athena.⁸² Chamaeleon's work *On Drunkenness* and Aristotle's *Constitution of the Locrians* are cited.⁸³

It is not immediately clear why Chamaeleon, in his work *On Drunkenness*, referred to Zaleucus acquiring laws from Athena. Two suggestions will be found in the literature. First, Chamaeleon may have chosen to group drunkenness together with inspired lawgiving and other forms of enthusiasm, e.g. mantic and poetic inspiration, in order to dignify drunkenness.⁸⁴ That is possible, especially if one thinks of moderate intoxication as against blind drunkenness. But that said, a second suggestion seems more compelling. It is that the legislation of Zaleucus addressed the issue of drinking unmixed wine. In Book 10 of *The Sophists at Dinner*, between a citation from Chamaeleon's work *On Aeschylus*⁸⁵ and one from Theophrastus (no work is mentioned),⁸⁶ we read that among the Western Locrians if anyone drank unmixed wine that was not prescribed by a doctor providing therapy, death was the penalty under the law laid down by Zaleucus (10.33 429A). A slightly fuller version is found in Aelian's *Miscellaneous History*. The law is said to belong among those that were laid down by Zaleucus with a view to need. The fact that the law applies to persons who are sick is stated explicitly. We are told that the penalty is death even if the patient recovers (2.37).⁸⁷ Both texts are narrowly concerned with people who are

⁸⁰ Cf. pseudo-Plato, *Minos* 319C-320B.

⁸¹ Cf. Herodotus, *Histories* 1.65.

⁸² The historical Zaleucus lived in the mid-seventh century BC. His legislation was notorious for its severity. The later tradition includes much that is legendary. See, e.g., Wolters (2002) 689.

⁸³ Cf. *Scholia on Pindar's Olympian Odes*, ed. Drachmann, on 11.17 = fr. 548A Rose³.

⁸⁴ Wehrli (1957) 4-5, Giordano (1977) 11, 116-17 and Repici (1977) 219.

⁸⁵ Text **43A**.

⁸⁶ Theophrastus 579B FHS&G.

⁸⁷ Theophrastus 579A FHS&G.

sick, but if Zaleucus was so careful to legislate against the unauthorized drinking of unmixed wine in a narrow context, will he or a subsequent Locrian legislator have ignored the wider context including symposia? It is hard to be certain, but a legislator interested in the upbringing of young citizens and in the behavior of all citizens is likely to ask whether the drinking of wine without water should be left largely unregulated.⁸⁸ My guess is that Zaleucus answered by introducing regulations that did more than control the therapeutic use of unmixed wine, and that Chamaeleon discussed the topic with historical references in his work *On Drunkenness*.⁸⁹ And if that is correct, this dialogue will have not only addressed a serious behavioral, i.e., ethical issue but also satisfied the curiosity of readers who wanted to know more about the ancients.

Looking now at the several fragments that focus on drunkenness, we can, I think, say that Chamaeleon did more than focus on a topic that invites discreditable anecdotes and amusing stories. In fact, such material is all but absent from the surviving fragments. We do hear of Cleomenes going mad as a result of heavy drinking (11), but the text hardly exhibits an enthusiasm for scandal. Rather Chamaeleon is following Herodotus closely. He targets the barbarians for blame and explains the Spartan use of *episkuthizein*. The barbarians are also targeted in the assertion that large drinking cups arrived in Greece from the barbarians (10). Chamaeleon's interest in historical evidence, both material and literary, is seen in his discussion of the rhyton (10), the Delphic injunction to drink wine during the dog-days of summer (12) and the legislation of Zaleucus (14). Most important may be that Chamaeleon attributes the heavy drinking of the barbarians to their lack of education (10). That he promoted education in *On Drunkenness* in conjunction with legislation concerning the use wine is, I think, likely. We may want to fault Chamaeleon for weak explanations concerning depictions of the

⁸⁸ See, e.g., Plato's *Laws* 1 636E-650B, a text that will have been known to all the early Peripatetics including Chamaeleon.

⁸⁹ It is quite possible that the reports of Aelian and Athenaeus concerning the therapeutic use of unmixed wine derive from Chamaeleon's work *On Drunkenness*, in which Zaleucus' legislation together with the role of Athena was introduced as part of an argument against unregulated drinking. See Koepke (1856) 40 and Scorza (1934) 37, Giordano (1977) 117 and Wehrli (1957) 75. But certainty is elusive, and the preceding reference to Chamaeleon in Athenaeus (10.33 428F = 43A) cites *On Aeschylus* and not *On Drunkenness*.

rhyton (10) and the words “one and two” (13), but before we say that such explanations reveal a weak mind that was unable to benefit from a proper education within the Peripatos, we should remember that dialogues make room for wrong-head views and that excerptors are likely to ignore the difference between setting out a view and endorsing it.

Works cited

- Arnott, G. 2000. “Athenaeus and the Epitome,” in Braund - Wilkins (2000) : 41-52.
- Braund, D. 2000. “Learning, Luxury and Empire: Athenaeus’ Roman Patron,” in Braund - Wilkins (2000): 3-22.
- Braund, D., Wilkins, J. eds. 2000. *Athenaeus and His World* (Exeter: University Press).
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. 1975, second edition 2005. *Aristotle on Emotion* (London: Duckworth).
- . 1984. *Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts* (Amsterdam: Grüner).
- . 2005. *Theophrastus of Eresus. Commentary Volume 8: Sources on rhetoric and poetics* (Leiden: Brill).
- . 2011. *Theophrastus of Eresus. Commentary Volume 6.1: Sources on Ethics* (Leiden: Brill).
- Giannantoni, G. 1977. *Scuole socratiche minori e filosofia ellenistica* (Bologna: Il Mulino).
- Gigon, O. 1987. *Aristotelis opera: Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*, vol. 3 (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Giordano, D. 1977. *Chamaeleontis Heracleotae Fragmenta* (Bologna: Patron).
- Gross, H. 1972. “Rhyton,” *Der Kleine Pauly*, vol. 4: 1426-7.
- Gulik, Ch.-B. 1933. *Athenaeus. Deipnosophistae*. vol. 5 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- Jacob, Chr. 2000. “Athenaeus the Librarian,” in Braund - Wilkins (2000): 85-110.
- Koepke, E. 1856. *De Chamaeleontis Heraclotae vita librorumque reliquiis* (Berlin: Hertz).
- Kranz, W. 1933. *Stasimon* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Mirhady, D. 1992. *The Political Thought of Theophrastus*, Diss. (New Brunswick).

- Moraux, P. 1951. *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain: Édition Universitaires de Louvain).
- Page, D.L. 1955. *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Pelling, Chr. 2000. "Fun with Fragments," in Braund - Wilkins (2000): 171-90.
- Repici, L. 1977. "Lo sviluppo delle dottrine etiche nel Peripato," in Giannantoni (1977): 215-43.
- Richter, G., Milne, M. 1935. *Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases* (New York: Plantin).
- Schütrumpf, E. 2009. "Heraclides Ponticus On Pleasure," in Pender, E.E., Fortenbaugh, W.W., eds., *Heraclides of Pontus: Discussion*. RUSCH 15 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction): 69-91.
- Schütrumpf, E. *et al.* 2008. *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translation*. RUSCH 14 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction).
- Schweighaeuser, I. 1801. *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Strassburg: Societas Bipontina).
- Scorza, G. 1934. "Il Peripatetico Cameleonte," *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica di Filologia-Lingua-Antichità* 18: 1-48.
- Walzer, R. 1929. *Magna Moralia und aristotelische Ethik* = Neue Philologische Untersuchungen 7 (Berlin: Weidemann).
- Wehrli, F. 1957. *Die Schule des Aristoteles* vol. 9 (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969. *Die Schule des Aristoteles* vol. 7² (Basel: Schwabe).
- Wilkins, J. 2000. "Dialogue and Comedy: The Structure of the *Deipnosophistae*," in Braund - Wilkins (2000): 23-40.
- Wolters, R. 2002. "Zaleukos," *Der Kleine Pauly*, vol. 12/2: 689.

5

Something to Do with Dionysus: Chamaeleon on the Origins of Tragedy

David Mirhady

In the *Poetics*, Aristotle draws a close connection between epic and tragedy, seeing tragedy largely as a development of the Homeric origins of Greek poetry into drama through a merging of the choral traditions of Dionysiac ritual with the mythic and poetic traditions of epic. Aristotle leaves aside lyric and elegiac poetry, even though they reached their zenith between the time of Homeric epic and classical Athenian tragedy, and he dealt with comedy in a second book of the *Poetics*, which survives only in fragmentary form. So for Aristotle (as we know him) poetics is essentially epic and tragedy

Within a context of literary research shaped by Aristotle, Chamaeleon clearly takes an interest in literary biography, but whether his interests in epic and tragedy, and in their writers, was more influenced by the Peripatetic context of his research or by the biographical form of his works is an important question. Clearly, with biographies on Sappho, Stesichorus, Pindar, *et al.*, his interests ranged more widely than epic and tragedy. On the occasion of a new edition of the evidence for his writings, his appearance may change, as his name suggests a chameleon might. The work of Arrighetti¹ has been very important for the

¹ Arrighetti (1987). Reviewed by Kirkwood (1988) 602-605. See also Goldolphin

current understanding of Chamaeleon. He characterizes what he called “Chamaeleon’s method” (*il metodo di Cameleonte*) as “the combination of literary scholarship and biography which assumes a correspondence between a poet’s work and his personal concerns and experiences.”² According to this method, which Arrighetti refers to as “*ricerca storico-letteraria*,” the ancient critics assume that they can recover the life of the poet from his work, that they can recover “history” from poetry. The procedure is of course prevalent in Greek literary criticism from Aristophanes’ comedy on and it is linked in particular with Satyrus. The quotation from Satyrus’ *Life of Euripides* reflects a sort of motto of this method (PCG fr. 59b K.-A. = Satyrus, *Life of Euripides* 39.9.25-28 Schorn³):

οἷα μὲν ποιεῖ λέγειν τοῖός ἐστιν

What someone does, so is he likely to speak.

Leo contended that ancient biographers so completely attached subjective validity to the works of ancient authors that they did not hesitate to reconstruct these authors’ lives out of the fictional world of their works.⁴ On the basis of the work of Köpke, Leo credited Chamaeleon with inventing this method,⁵ but it was clearly in use already in the 5th century even if not in a context specifically devoted to the writing of biography as a distinct genre. Even Satyrus’ famous motto is actually a quotation of his from Aristophanes regarding Euripides.

Aristophanes clearly expresses the idea in *Thesmophoriazusae* (164-167):

καὶ Φρύνιχος - τοῦτον γὰρ οὖν ἀκήκοας -
αὐτός τε καλὸς ἦν καὶ καλῶς ἡμπίσχετο·
διὰ τοῦτ’ ἄρ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ κάλ’ ἦν τὰ δράματα.
ὅμοια γὰρ ποιεῖν ἀνάγκη τῇ φύσει.

And you’ve heard about Phrynichus: how beautiful he was and how beautifully he dressed. For this reason his dramas were also beautiful, for the poet must create them like his own nature.

(1932) 275-80.

² Kirkwood (1988) 602-3.

³ Schorn (2004).

⁴ Leo (1901).

⁵ Köpke (1856); see esp. 20.

It seems echoed in our text **43A**, where Athenaeus credits to Chamaeleon the thought that Aeschylus was a drunk, so he portrayed the Argonauts as drunk in his *Cabiri*:

ἃ δ' αὐτὸς ὁ τραγωδιοποιὸς ἐποίει ταῦτα τοῖς ἥρωσι περιέθηκε·

What the tragedian did himself he applied to the heroes.

The fundamental point, that poets' writings reflect their characters, is offered as an explanation for why tragedies are written the way they are. But obviously in the case of Aristophanes, so also likely in the case of Chamaeleon, this sort of reasoning need not be taken seriously. A few lines earlier in *Thesmophoriazusae*, the same character, Agathon, seems to acknowledge, ironically, just the opposite of this biographical method:

ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν, πρὸς ταῦτα τοὺς τρόπους ἔχειν.
αὐτίκα γυναικεῖ' ἦν ποιῇ τις δράματα,
μετουσίαν δεῖ τῶν τρόπων τὸ σῶμ' ἔχειν.

A poet must adopt his behaviors to that of his creations. So, as soon as someone makes female characters, his own body has to adopt their behaviors.

Of course the entire premise of *Thesmophoriazusae* is that the women of Athens are inferring that Euripides is a misogynist because he creates misogynistic characters, such as Hippolytus, or Jason in the *Medea*. Aristophanes holds up the entire idea as ridiculous.

In **43A** Athenaeus' starting point seems actually to be that drunkenness leads to a loss of reason and so to aberrant behavior (427E-428E). So it is in order to make the claim that Aeschylus made the mistake of simply getting drunk that he cites the evidence of Jason's companions in Aeschylus' *Cabiri*, which allows us to look again, in a wider context, at the crucial passage in our text:

ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν Αἰσχύλον ἐγὼ φαίην ἂν τοῦτο διαμαρτάνειν· πρῶτος γὰρ ἐκεῖνος καὶ οὐχ, ὥς ἐνιοὶ φασιν, Εὐριπίδης παρήγαγε τὴν τῶν μεθύοντων ὄψιν εἰς τραγωδίαν. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς Καβείροις εἰσάγει τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἰάσονα μεθύοντας. ἃ δ' αὐτὸς ὁ τραγωδοποιὸς ἐποίει, ταῦτα τοῖς ἥρωσι περιέθηκε· μεθύων γοῦν ἔγραφε τὰς τραγωδίας. διὸ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς αὐτῷ μεμφόμενος ἔλεγεν ὅτι· ὦ Αἰσχύλε, εἰ καὶ τὰ δέοντα ποιεῖς, ἀλλ' οὖν οὐκ εἰδώς γε ποιεῖς", ὥς ἱστορεῖ Χαμαιλέων ἐν τῷ περὶ Αἰσχύλου.

390 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

I would say that Aeschylus also made this mistake. For he was the first – and not Euripides, as some say – to introduce the sight of drunken characters into tragedy. For in the *Cabiri* he depicts the companions of Jason drunk, and what the composer of tragedy did himself he applied to the heroes; in short, he wrote his tragedies while drunk. Therefore Sophocles criticized his tragedies and said, “Aeschylus, even if you write what you should, still, you don’t do it consciously.” So Chamaeleon reports in his *On Aeschylus*.

The data for the whole discussion of Aeschylus as drinker seem to be two, the *Cabiri* passage and a remark of Sophocles. The remark of Sophocles says only that Aeschylus wrote his poetry in ignorance, not that he did so while drunk, and in **43A** Athenaeus only attributes the Sophocles quotation to Chamaeleon, not the connection to drunkenness.

In **43B**, however, Athenaeus does give evidence for Chamaeleon making the connection, explicitly attributing to Chamaeleon the claim about Aeschylus’ drunkenness, but I think it would be fair to suppose that Athenaeus was here working in short-hand, substituting “Chamaeleon says Aeschylus composed drunk,” for “Chamaeleon reports that there are drunks in Aeschylus’ *Cabiri*,” and then, ironically, “a poet writes what’s in his own character.” That is, we may be able to excuse Chamaeleon from this biographical fallacy if it is actually Athenaeus, or rather his character Ulpian, who makes these inferences. No other source, whether Aristophanes in *Frogs* or the anonymous *Life of Aeschylus*, says that Aeschylus was a drunkard.⁶ And a page later in Athenaeus, in our text **13**, Chamaeleon is accused of being unfamiliar with Alcaeus’ predilection for wine, although he must have read his poetry where drinking is described. That is, Chamaeleon did not always infer a poet’s drinking from a description of drinking in his poetry. I remain unconvinced that Chamaeleon made this claim, despite what Athenaeus says in our text **43B**.

Chamaeleon’s quotation of Sophocles seems the real focus of **43A**:

ὦ Αἰσχύλε, εἰ καὶ τὰ δέοντα ποιεῖς, ἀλλ’ οὖν οὐκ εἰδώς γε ποιεῖς.

Aeschylus, even if you compose what you should, you still do it unknowingly.

It should recall Aristotle’s quotation of Sophocles in the *Poetics* (1460b34-35):

⁶ Aeschylus T 117a-d Radt all stem from this source. T 117e-g stem from Callisthenes, Aristotle’s nephew, hardly an independent source.

καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἷους δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἷοι εἶσιν.

Sophocles said that he himself composed people as they should be, but Euripides composed them as they are.

It seems likely that Aristotle and Chamaeleon both drew on the same repository of Sophoclean sayings.⁷ Both sayings share an apparent Sophoclean interest in things “as they should be.” The quotation implies that Sophocles himself knows what ought to be written and does so. One possibility is that he is accusing Aeschylus of incompetence, of writing well only by accident. Another, which is suggested by the context in Athenaeus, is that somehow Aeschylus’ drunkenness itself, and not his literary ability, facilitates his writing well. We can leave aside the many contradictory consequences of this interpretation, such as that Athenaeus says that Aeschylus makes a mistake in drinking but still somehow writes what Sophocles thinks he should and the fact that Aeschylus also wrote many tragedies in which there are no drunken characters.

Another possible interpretation of the Sophocles quotation is that we may infer a Dionysian inspiration for Aeschylus’ poetic activity. The Platonic view that poets wrote as a result of divine inspiration, without actually understanding their craft, is well known (Plato, *Apology* 22b-c, *Ion* 533e, *Meno* 99d, *Phaedrus* 245a). However, in the *Phaedrus*, Socrates illustrates someone’s pretense to knowledge of tragedy by again citing Sophocles (269a):

οὐκοῦν καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς τὸν σφισιν ἐπιδεικνύμενον τὰ πρὸ τραγωδίας ἄν φαίη ἄλλ’ οὐ τὰ τραγικὰ.

So Sophocles would say that the man exhibited the preliminaries of tragedy, not tragedy itself.

I do not mean to insist that Plato has Aeschylus in mind when he has Sophocles say that someone knew only the preliminaries of tragedy – though it seems possible – but only that there seems a wide range of meanings for Sophocles’ claim that Aeschylus did not know what

⁷ To these sayings we could add another, from Stobaeus 3.6.18: “About Euripides someone used to say that he was a misogynist; Sophocles said, ‘but not in bed’.” It seems possible that there is reference to Soph. *OT* 1008.

he was doing. He may be suggesting that Aeschylus had some divine inspiration, or he may be saying that Aeschylus' knowledge of the art of tragedy was incomplete. Indeed, Aristotle is likely to have agreed that Sophocles, as opposed to Aeschylus, was the first complete master of this art. Both the anonymous *Life of Aeschylus* 8-10 and Plutarch, *Cimon* 8.7-8, report that, in an acrimonious atmosphere, a young Sophocles defeated Aeschylus in the tragic competition, as a result of which Aeschylus retired from Athens.⁸

The evidence for Chamaeleon's biographical method with regard to Aeschylus seems to allow for many interpretations. The "literary-biographical method" outlined by Arrighetti does not seem inescapable. What seems clear is that Chamaeleon had access to a collection of sayings of Sophocles, to which Plato also already had access. More important than any fallacious inference about Aeschylus being drunk may be the claim that he was the first to portray drunks on the tragic stage, a peculiar blending of tragedy with the drunken behavior that must have characterized the satyr plays and phallic songs with which Aristotle had associated tragedy's Dionysian origins.

Prôta Heurêmata

In a very useful note,⁹ Martin West dissects some of the different sorts of information concerning the early figures of Athenian tragedy that are transmitted by the Suda. For play titles, for instance, he suggests Callimachus' *Pinakes* as the Suda's source. For dating, especially in relation to Olympiads, he suggests Eratosthenes. But he isolates some passages as "excerpts from a presumably Peripatetic account of the early tragedians' individual innovations":¹⁰

⁸ Thucydides 1.22.1 may also be relevant here. Admitting that he cannot always report speeches from precise knowledge, he says that he wrote what seemed to him *ta deonta* in each situation. If the same idea were applied to Sophocles' statement to Aeschylus, it would suggest that although Aeschylus' mastery of tragedy was imperfect, he wrote what Sophocles thought he should.

⁹ West (1989).

¹⁰ West (1989) 253: "The bulk of the Suda's information on Thespis, then, may go back to Chamaeleon... The parallel entries on Choerilus, Phrynichus, and Pratinas perhaps derive from the same original account, if not from other Peripatetic work."

1) s.v. Thespis: ... τραγικὸς ἰς' ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου γενομένου τραγωδιοποιοῦ Ἐπιγένους τοῦ Σικυωνίου τιθεμένος, ὥς δέ τινες δεύτερος μετὰ Ἐπιγένην. ἄλλοι δὲ αὐτὸν πρῶτον τραγικὸν γενέσθαι φασί. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν χρίσας τὸ πρόσωπον ψιμυθίῳ ἐτραγώδησεν, εἶτα ἀνδράχνη ἐσκέπασεν ἐν τῷ ἐπιδεικνύσθαι, καὶ, μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσήνεγκε καὶ τὴν τῶν προσοπείων χρήσιν ἐν μόνῃ ὀθόνῃ κατασκευάσας.

... a tragic poet, 16th after the first writer of tragedies, Epigenes of Sicyon,¹¹ but some [say] the second after Epigenes; others say that he was the first tragedian. At first he performed after having rubbed his face with white lead, then he covered [his face] with purslane in his performance, and after that he also introduced the use of masks made solely from linen.

2) s.v. Choerilus: οὗτος κατὰ τινὰς τοῖς προσωπέοις καὶ τῇ σκηνῇ τῶν στολῶν ἐπεχείρησεν.

This man, according to some, tried innovations in masks and the staging of costumes.¹²

3) s.v. Phrynichus: οὗτος δὲ πρῶτος ὁ Φρύνιχος γυναικείον πρόσωπον εἰσήγαγεν ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ καὶ εὐρετὴς τοῦ τετραμέτρου ἐγένετο.

This man first introduced a feminine mask on the stage and was the inventor of tetrameter.

4) s.v. Pratinas: καὶ πρῶτος ἔγραψε Σατύρους. ἐπιδεικνυμένου δὲ τούτου συνέβη τὰ ἱκρία. ἐφ' ὧν ἐστήκεσαν οἱ θεαταί, πεσεῖν, καὶ ἐκ τούτου θέατρον ὠκοδομήθη Ἀθηναίοις.

He was the first to write satyr plays. While this man was exhibiting a play, it happened that the benches on which the spectators were standing collapsed, and because of this a theatre was constructed for the Athenians.

Could all of these accounts derive from Chamaeleon? As West points out, this is the sort of history that Aristotle alludes to in *Poet.* 1449a37ff.

¹¹ West (1989) 252 suggests Heraclides as author of the suggestion that Thespis was 16th after Epigenes of Sicyon. In this text, Chamaeleon is represented by the “others,” after the part in italics.

¹² Suda On Line reports that “Suda manuscripts have τῇ σκηνῇ τῶν στολῶν ‘the stage of the costumes (?); Kuster suggested τῇ σκηνῇ τῶν στολῶν ‘the style of the costumes.’”

394 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

αἱ μὲν οὖν τῆς τραγωδίας μεταβάσεις καὶ δι' ὧν ἐγένοντο οὐ λελήθασιν.

The various changes of tragedy and through whom they arose are well known.

We should note that the Suda entry that refers us to Chamaeleon's work on Thespis is not the entry on Thespis. But the entry on "Nothing to do with Dionysus," our **41**, has a similar structure, beginning with claims made about Epigenes (in 1 in italics), which are rejected, before going on to give the preferred account.

I should admit that any claims about Chamaeleon's being the source of these *prôta heurêmata* stand on fairly weak evidence.¹³ Aristotle already makes claims about such innovations in tragedy in the *Poetics*, so there seems a sense in which they represent the common stock of the Peripatetics' researches of literary history. But if we follow West's suggestion and accept the lexicographer's use of them as relying on Chamaeleon, and if we see them as occurring either in his work *On Thespis* or in his work *On Aeschylus*, then certain other things follow. Thespis and Aeschylus would become, for Chamaeleon, not just subjects of biographies, but critical points in the history of tragedy (and poetry in general) in reference to whom the other figures and developments in early tragedy are considered. In the Peripatetic understanding of an evolution from dithyrambs and phallic songs to tragedy, Thespis is the first to be identified as a tragedian and the first to develop the rudimentary mask from the face smeared with white lead or gypsum, and so the first to develop a character as distinct from the chorus. According to Aristotle's account, however, this tragedy may not yet have distinguished itself from comedy, as would befit a satyr song and a perhaps bizarre mask. The tragedy will also have been improvised, as Thespis, as leader of the song, made up short "plots."¹⁴

As has been mentioned, in **43A** Chamaeleon makes a claim about Aeschylus being the first to depict drunkenness in tragedy. To this we may add Aristotle's claim that Aeschylus introduced the second actor (*Poet.* 1449a15-17). What emerges from different members of the Peripatos is quite a consistent picture of the different elements of early tragedy. Aristotle himself was mainly concerned with plot (*mythos*),

¹³ Taplin (1977) 438 n. 2, suggests that the Peripatetics "seem to have been particularly free in inventing material to fill up the required *topoi*" of literary biographies.

¹⁴ Lloyd-Jones (1990) 225-237, esp. 226-7, shows an appropriate skepticism regarding the claimed titles of Thespis' tragedies.

character (*êthos*), and style (*lexis*). He was uninterested in other parts of tragedy, such as spectacle (*opsis*), on the grounds that they were outside the art of poetics (*Poet.* 1450b17, 1453b7-8). Chamaeleon, whose form of writing is not a systematic work on poetry *per se* but literary biography of tragedians, had greater scope for including inventions and innovations that each tragedian accomplished, whether poetic or in any other aspect of the theatre.

The Role of the Chorus

It is difficult to discern how much of **45** represents the thought of Chamaeleon. He may be limited to the idea that the quotation in ll. 11-12 is from Platon's *Skeuai* and not Aristophanes. But the beginning of our text ("in dance and procession") certainly picks up ideas from Plato's *Laws* 796c, where a rule is proposed that children making ritual observances to the gods, "in dance and procession," should make their supplications with military dress and decorum, and 815b-d, where forms of dance befitting citizens are prescribed, the Dionysian dances being notably excluded.

The account of the historical development of dance in ll. 3-5 again suggests the sorts of interests Chamaeleon shows in **41**. The definition of *hyporchêma* that Athenaeus suggests seems suspiciously like one that a philosopher might devise on the basis of etymology. Athenaeus alludes to such a definition a couple pages later, at 631C: "the hyporchematic dance is one in which the chorus sings while dancing." The word is normally used much more widely, even in Athenaeus, to refer to lively and/or mimetic dances both within and outside dramatic productions. So it seems that in Athenaeus we have a sort of philosophical definition doing battle with practical usages of the term. In 15D Athenaeus says that this style of dance flourished during the time of Xenodemus and Pindar (and Aeschylus) and that it is "an imitation of actions interpreted through language" (μίμησις τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς λέξεως ἐρμηνευομένων πραγμάτων), a wonderfully Peripatetic sounding definition. It could well be that a Peripatetic like Chamaeleon coined it in order to categorize dance and the chorus within the Peripatetic scheme.

Many references to this term and to dance in general, including that of Chamaeleon in **45**, pertain to both tragedy and comedy. There seems a general concern that dancing of whatever sort befit the status of the

dancers. From a Peripatetic perspective, the subordination of the dance to the function of portraying language that fits the plot of the drama seems entirely consistent with Aristotle's program in the *Poetics*. For Chamaeleon's interests in Aeschylus it seems worthwhile to glance briefly at a passage in *Libation Bearers* (1024-25), where Orestes uses the language of a chorus to express his conflicted emotions after having killed his mother:

πρὸς δὲ καρδίαι φόβος
αἰδεῖν ἑτοῖμος ἦδ' ὑπορχεῖσθαι κότῳ.¹⁵

In my heart, fear is ready to sing and dance in accompaniment with wrath.

Even if the text suggests that fear be subordinate to wrath, it is clear that this dance, metaphorically a *hyporchêma*, is imagined likewise as being done as an accompaniment to, or subordinate to, a song. Here is Aeschylus using the sort of language that Athenaeus may be associating with Chamaeleon.¹⁶

Text **44** begins by drawing a connection between the costumes worn in ritual and those worn by the chorus in Aeschylus' tragedies. It is admittedly unclear whether this connection is Chamaeleon's or only Athenaeus', but it is entirely possible that Chamaeleon made the connection inasmuch as the choral movements that Chamaeleon clearly did discuss are closely connected to the costumes of the chorus. Aristotle certainly associates the idea of solemnity (*semnotês* l. 2) with tragedy (*Poet.* 1448b25-6), particularly in its mature form (1449a20).

We could easily add Chamaeleon's claims about the choral inventiveness of Aeschylus to the list of inventions collected by West. Moreover, by excluding a distinct choral director, Aeschylus seems more able to integrate the choral movements into, as Athenaeus/Chamaeleon says, the "management" (l. 8) of the tragedy. We might note that although he recognizes him as the most tragic of poets, Aristotle accuses Euripides

¹⁵ Cf. *Choephoroi* 166, where the chorus begs Electra, "my heart dances through fear" (ὀρχεῖται δὲ καρδία φόβῳ).

¹⁶ At the end of our text **45**, in l.14, Athenaeus returns to the language of decorum, specifically the word εὐσχημον, which also appears in l. 1. Although Athenaeus associates the term with martial movements, in *Nicomachean Ethics* 1128a23-25 Aristotle associates it with the history of drama, particularly comedy, in terms of language.

of “managing” other aspects of tragedy badly (*Poetics* 1453a28-30). One of these other aspects seems to have been the chorus (1456a25-27):

καὶ τὸν χορὸν δὲ ἓνα δεῖ ὑπολαμβάνειν τῶν ὑποκρίτων, καὶ μῶριον εἶναι τοῦ ὅλου καὶ συναγωνίζεσθαι μὴ ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδῃ ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ Σοφοκλεῖ.

The chorus too must be understood as one of the actors. It must be part of the whole and share in the action, not as in Euripides but as in Sophocles.

44 also offers us a suggestion about Athenaeus’ method, for here he offers Chamaeleon not simply as a source of lines from Aeschylus or Platon, but for the claim about Aeschylus’ choral inventiveness. Then he follows that claim with one about the reliability of Aristophanes’ comedies for such biographical details and then with quotations, apparently from two different Aristophanic plays, one in which Aeschylus himself makes the claim about his own inventiveness and a second from a character confirming the great variety of dance forms Aeschylus used even within one scene. It seems altogether likely that Athenaeus took the entire passage from Chamaeleon, who therefore used Aristophanes as his source. Here Chamaeleon’s biographical method is not based on anything as fallacious as what appears in **43A-B**, where an inference is based on a passage in one of Aeschylus’ own plays. Instead, like the modern scholar, Chamaeleon gives consideration to the reliability of the biographical information in Aristophanes as a writer of comedy. (Perhaps he finally gives it more credibility than we would, but we go through the same discussions now ourselves, and with differing results.) Then Chamaeleon uses two different kinds of passages from Aristophanes to support his claim, both of which seem entirely appropriate. As evidence for his general claim, they are as good as any modern scholar could hope to have.

Something to do with Dionysus

Recent scholarship on Greek tragedy and its origin has been replete with questions about its relationship to Dionysian ritual and to the civic institutions of Athens, particularly its democratic institutions.¹⁷ The seminal ideas of Nietzsche that inspired 20th-century scholarship, about the es-

¹⁷ See, e.g., Winkler-Zeitlin (1990), and Czapo-Miller (2007); Friedrich (1996).

sential interplay of Dionysian and Apollonian elements in tragedy, have certainly been challenged. In one recent article, the entire connection between tragedy and Dionysus has been described as almost accidental: the sanctuary of Dionysus on the slopes of the Acropolis happened to have the best setting for a theatre and only for this reason did his festivals appropriate theatrical performances.¹⁸ But most scholars still see Athenian tragedy having something to do with Dionysus and his ritual.

Despite Aristotle's apparent lack of interest in many of the details of Dionysian ritual, he and the Peripatetic school are largely responsible for the faith modern scholarship has had in the connections between Dionysus and tragedy. In the *Poetics*, Aristotle refers to the origins of tragedy in choral dithyrambs, phallic rituals, and satyr plays, which we reasonably assume were devoted to, and largely concerned with, Dionysus (1449a9-21). But Aristotle leaves out of his account a systematic, historical narrative of the transition. By his time tragedy had reached (and passed) its fully developed state, and he points out that by his time the best tragedies selected for their subjects the heroes and their families from the epic cycle, tragedy being a continuation and improvement on the epic tradition in dramatic form (1453a17-21, 1454a9-12). In Aristotle's account the only vestige of ritual appears to be in tragedy's accomplishment of the *katharsis* of states of pity and fear (1449b27-28), the ritual idea of spiritual purification reduced to its emotional aspects, a notoriously tantalizing suggestion the interpretation of which continues to fill endless pages of classical scholarship, to say nothing of popular psychology and literary analysis. Chamaeleon appears to have been in complete accord with Aristotle's account, but he filled in gaps in it with his biographical approach. He did not write a work entitled *On the Origin and Early History of Tragedy*, but he did write works both *On Thespis* (2.8) and *On Aeschylus* (2.5), which appear to have led the lexicographers to go to him for what they took to be a sensible account of early tragedy and its relationship, or non-relationship, with Dionysian ritual.

In 41, the Suda first offers an unsatisfactory explanation for the origin of the saying "Nothing to do with Dionysus": people called out the saying when Epigenes had composed a tragedy in honor of Dionysus, the implication being, apparently, that his tragedy *per se* did not honor Dionysus. Then begins the preferred explanation. (That it represents an excerpted quotation rather than a paraphrase, whether of Chamaeleon or some intermediate source, seems certain from the fact that the pronoun *τούτοις* in

¹⁸ Scullion (2002).

line 3 has no clear antecedent.) Earlier they, presumably poets competing in the Dionysia, were competing “with these,” having written them in honor of Dionysus. We don’t know what “these” compositions were. We might refer to them as “Dionysiaca;” perhaps they were dithyrambs or phallic songs, or satyr songs, as the Suda says they were also called. At any rate, no one doubted their connection to Dionysus. Later, little by little, the same poets – or perhaps better to say the same tradition of poets – presumably composing for the Dionysia, made a transition to writing tragedies and no longer recalled Dionysus in them. They turned instead to “myths and histories.” The transition was gradual. The suggestion is that tragedies at first did deal with and so honor Dionysus.

The work of Chamaeleon that is cited for reporting things “very similar” (παραπλήσια) to this account is *On Thespis*. Thespis is reported by many to have invented tragedy, or at any rate to have brought it to Athens for the first time. The Suda, however, uses the plural of the writers it discusses, so it seems likely that Chamaeleon also discussed several other writers, as well as Thespis. The critical sentence, moreover, indicates that the writers (plural) made the transition to tragedies and then, little by little, introduced myths and histories.

Several authors offer texts that are very similar to or identical with the Suda’s.¹⁹ Passing over those that are identical, let’s look at the following similar texts:

Diogenianus 7.18 “Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον.” ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα φλυαρούντων. πρῶτον γὰρ τὰ Διονύσου ᾄδοντες οἱ ποιηταί, ὕστερον κατεφρόνουν. οἱ οὖν τοῦ Διονυσίου ἔλεγον, Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον.

“Nothing to do with Dionysus”: with regard to those blathering inappropriately. For the poets who at first sang Dionysian songs later disrespected him, so the Dionysians began saying, “Nothing to do with Dionysus.”

Zenobius 5.40 “Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον.” ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις λεγόντων ἢ παροιμία εἴρηται. ἐπειδὴ τῶν χορῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰθισμένων διθύραμβον ᾄδειν εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον, οἱ ποιηταί ὕστερον ἐκβάντες τὴν συνήθειαν ταύτην, Αἴαντας καὶ Κενταύρους γράφειν ἐπεχείρουν. Ὅθεν οἱ θεώμενοι σκώπτοντες ἔλεγον, Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον. Διὰ γοῦν τοῦτο τοὺς Σατύρους ὕστερον ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς προεισάγειν, ἵνα μὴ δοκῶσι ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ.

¹⁹ See also Photius, *s.v.*, Apostolius 13.42, and Pausanias Atticista 32.1-6.

400 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

“Nothing to do with Dionysus”: The proverb has been said with regard to those saying things inappropriate to the subject matter. Although the choruses at the beginning were accustomed to sing the dithyramb in honor of Dionysus, the poets later departed from this custom and began to write *Ajaxes* and *Centaurus*. From that time the viewers made jokes and said, “Nothing to do with Dionysus.” So for this reason it seemed best to them to introduce the satyr plays, so they would not seem to be forgetting the god.

Plutarch, *De proverbiis Alexandrinum* 30 “τὰ μηδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον.” τὴν κωμωδίαν καὶ τὴν τραγωδίαν ἀπὸ γέλωτος εἰς τὸν ἱβίον φασὶ παρελθεῖν. καὶ <γὰρ> κατὰ καιρὸν τῆς συγκομιδῆς τῶν γεννημάτων παραγενομένους τινὰς ἐπὶ τὰς ληνοὺς καὶ τοῦ γλεύκους πίνοντας [ποιήματα τινα] σκώπτειν· ὕστερον δὲ σκωπτικὰ ποιήματά τινα καὶ γράφειν, <ᾧ> διὰ τὸ πρότερον ἐν κώμαις ᾄδεσθαι κωμωδίαν καλεῖσθαι. ἤρχοντο δὲ καὶ συνεχέστερον εἰς τὰς κώμας τὰς Ἀττικὰς γύψῳ τὰς ὄψεις κεχρισμένοι καὶ ἔσκωπτον. τραγικὰ παρeisφέροντες, <ἐπὶ τὸ> αὐστηρότερον μετῆλθον.

“Nothing to do with Dionysus.” They say that comedy and tragedy came into life from laughter. For at the time of the vintage people came to the presses and, after drinking the raw wine, made jokes. Later they also write down the joking verses, and because they were first sung in the villages (*komai*) were called comedy. In the beginning they frequently visited the villages of Attica with gypsum smeared on their faces and made jokes. By introducing tragic events they moved on to something more austere.

Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* 615A Φρυνίχου καὶ Αἰσχύλου τὴν τραγωδίαν εἰς μύθους καὶ πάθη προαγόντων, ἐλέχθη τὸ ‘τί ταῦτα πρὸς Διόνυσον;’

When Phrynichus and Aeschylus introduced tragedy to myths and emotions, it was asked, “what’s this got to do with Dionysus?”

All four of these passages seem to be relating basically the same information in different forms, all of them “very near” (παραπλήσια), we might say, that of Chamaeleon related in the *Suda* (41). In connection with the same proverb, Plutarch says that Phrynichus and Aeschylus led tragedy into “myths and emotions.”²⁰ These seem to correspond to the

²⁰ The collocations of the words *mythoi* and *pathê* occurs also in Gorgias, 82 F 23 D.-K. in Plut., *De gloria Atheniensium* 5 348D (cf. *Moralia* 15D). For Aristotle, a *pathos* is a technical word in tragedy: *Poet.* 1452b9 δύο μὲν οὖν τοῦ μύθου μέρη ταῦτ’ ἐστί, περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις· τρίτον δὲ πάθος. τούτων δὲ περιπέτεια μὲν καὶ ἀναγνώρισις εἴρηται, πάθος δὲ ἐστὶ πρᾶξις φθαρτικὴ ἢ ὀδυνηρά, οἷον οἷ τε ἐν τῷ φανερώ θάνατοι καὶ αἱ περιωδυνίαι καὶ τρώσεις καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα. *We*

Suda's "myths and histories," which Zenobius in turn makes specific by referring to "*Ajaxes* and *Centaur*s." In the *Poetics*, Aristotle points out that Homer composed, as he calls them, "dramatic *mimêseis*" (1448b35-6; cf. 1448a20-23), not of course in the sense that his poetry demanded actors dramatizing parts but in the sense that it has multiple characters who are given speeches that propel the action.²¹ When Zenobius mentions "*Ajaxes* and *Centaur*s" he is perhaps alluding to the Trojan stories of the Greater and Lesser Ajaxes and the earlier generation of heroes, such as Heracles and Theseus, who did battle with the centaurs.²² Scullion has recently argued that it never occurred to Aristotle "that one of the developments tragedy went through was a shift from Dionysiac to general mythological subject matter, and he probably assumed from the beginning tragedy dealt with myth in general."²³ Aristotle clearly did, however, have a sense of which mythology worked best for tragedy, and he thought that the tragedians had also, over time, recognized this (*Poetics* 1453a17-21). He seems to have left it to colleagues like Chamaeleon to spell this out.

The crucial point here, which becomes clearer when we reflect on Aristotle's *Poetics*, is that tragedy involves – what the satyr-songs and so on had not done – myths, that is, plots in the sense of connected dramatic narratives. The phallic songs were ritual dances celebrating the god. Although they were clearly mimetic dramas involving both move-

see then that two elements of the plot, reversal and discovery, turn upon these incidents. A third element is a pathos. Of these three elements we have already described reversal and discovery. A suffering (pathos) is a destructive or painful occurrence, such as a death on the stage, acute suffering and wounding and so on.

²¹ Cf. Depew (2007).

²² Homer, *Od.* 21.295-304, describes how the drunkenness of the centaur Eurytion at the wedding of Pirithous and Hippodamia led to ongoing strife between men and centaurs. In *Il.* 1.263-68, Nestor describes deeds of the generation before the Achaeans at Troy in terms of their fighting against the centaurs. Ovid's substitution of a somewhat comical centauromachy for the battles of the Trojan War in *Met.* 12 suggests that the centaurs may also have been the subject of comedies in early Greek drama also. It seems possible, but unlikely, that the reference is to the *Centaur* of Chaeremon (Arist., *Poet.* 1447b21-22), a rhapsodic composition with a mixture of meters and thus a hybrid, like a centaur.

Two of Aeschylus' lost tetralogies will have featured Telamonian Ajax prominently, and of course one of Sophocles' seven surviving plays deals with him. Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 125 n. 1, suggests that the reference to centaurs may be to a dithyramb by Lasus and that to *Ajaxes* may be to a dithyramb by Timotheus.

²³ Scullion (2002) 110.

ment and words, their ability to portray myths must have been limited.²⁴ As Wehrli points out, the account approved in the Suda conforms with that in Aristotle, *Poetics* 1449a9-21:

At any rate [tragedy] originated in improvisation – both tragedy itself and comedy. The one came from the leaders of the dithyramb and the other from the leaders of the phallic songs which still survive as institutions in many cities. Tragedy then evolved little by little (*kata mikron*) as men introduced (*proagontôn*) each element that came to light and after going through many changes, it stopped when it had reached its own natural form. Thus it was Aeschylus who first raised the number of the actors from one to two. He also curtailed (*êlattôse*) the chorus and gave the dialogue the leading part ... Being a development of the *satyrikon*, it was quite late before tragedy rose from short plots and comic diction to its full dignity, and that the iambic meter was used instead of the tetrameter.²⁵

Like Chamaeleon, Aristotle emphasizes the gradual evolution of tragedy. In the beginning there were short plots improvised by the choral leaders, comic diction, and tetrameter. This must have been the tragedy of Thespis in the Peripatetic account. As we learn from **44** and **45**, in Chamaeleon's account Aeschylus also both curtails the chorus and dignifies the dance, making it subordinate to the words, as well as, presumably, to the two actors. At 22a Athenaeus says that Thespis, Pratinas, Cratinas, and Phrynicus – Aeschylus is notably excluded – were themselves called “dancers” (*orchêstai*) because they not only put their own dramas to the dancing of the chorus, but gave teaching in dance to those who wanted it. These “ancient poets” (*archaioi poiêtai*) seem to be the same poets referred to in **45** as “the poets, even from the beginning” (*kai ex arches ... hoi poiêtai*), and it could well be that Chamaeleon is the source for the “hyporcheme” of Pratinas, in which a Dionysian chorus demands that the *aulos* take a subservient role to the song of the chorus (Athen. 14 617b-f). These passages seem part and parcel of the argument for the subordination of music to dance, dance to song, and song to plot.²⁶

²⁴ Steinhardt (2007) discusses, however, a wide range of stories that were depicted through dance.

²⁵ Cf. *Rhet.* 3.1 1404a30-5, where Aristotle notes tragedy's increasing use of regular speech.

²⁶ Lloyd-Jones (1990) 229 notes the emphasis given by Pratinas (617b) that the *aulos*-players and their chorus members were hired for pay. The poets in **45** created their dances for the free.

At *Poetics* 1456a25-30 Aristotle wishes to put the chorus on a par with the actors, essentially eliminating the distinctly choral elements, such as song and dance, from tragedy. In this, Chamaeleon sees a different path of development: Aeschylus subordinated dance to the plot of the tragedy. He would thus avoid Aristotle's criticism – that choral songs were so unrelated to the action of the play that they could be sung in any play – by making the choral performance serve the needs of the episodic action. Aristotle, of course, thought that tragedy could produce its effect even without dance, as epic does (*Poetics* 1462a11-12).²⁷

Diogenes Laertius, when he wants to give a short-hand account of the development of tragedy, retails a series of events that is by now very familiar (3.56):

τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν τῇ τραγωδίᾳ πρότερον μὲν μόνοις ὁ χορὸς διεδραμάτιζεν, ὕστερον δὲ Θέσπης ἓνα ὑποκριτικὴν ἐξεῦρεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαναπαύεσθαι τὸν χορὸν καὶ δεύτερον Αἰσχύλος, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σοφοκλῆς καὶ συνεπλήρωσεν τὴν τραγωδίαν.

In ancient times in tragedy at first the chorus alone performed the drama. Later Thespis invented one actor, in order to give the chorus a break, and Aeschylus a second and Sophocles the third and filled out the tragedy.

As simplistic as it is, this scheme seems to reflect the Peripatetic history of early tragedy. Tragedy is “invented” when Thespis separates the first actor from the chorus. Aristotle put great emphasis on this development as he saw the proliferation of actors as enabling the telling of stories (*mythoi*), which he took to be the essential element, the formal cause, of tragedy. Although he worked within the same Peripatetic tradition and clearly had a detailed knowledge of the Homeric epics that gave rise to the stories that Aristotle privileged, Chamaeleon seems to have recognized that the choral element of tragedy had something to do with the Dionysian origins of tragedy and took an interest in how Aeschylus attempted to subordinate (and preserve?) the choral and dance aspects of tragedy. Aristotle might have regarded them simply as spectacle, as outside poetry, but Chamaeleon took an interest both in their ritual as-

²⁷ At *Poetics* 1449b37-1450b20, Aristotle lays out his hierarchy of tragedy, all of its other parts, character, thought, diction, song, and spectacle, ultimately subordinated to plot. Here dance is not even mentioned; presumably it is somehow subsumed under song and spectacle.

pect, in the costumes that resembled those of the mystery rites, and in the movements that also gave expression to civic and military values. He accommodated these interests within the Peripatetic scheme by identifying Aeschylus' choral dances as subordinate to the plots of his tragedies and as integral to Aeschylus' overall "management" of his tragedies' productions.

Appendix: Homeric Epic

In **15** Tatian tells us that Chamaeleon was one of a number of writers who investigated the genus of Homer's poetry and the time when he reached his acme. Tatian is concerned to show that Christian and Jewish learning is older than Greek by demonstrating that Moses was older than Homer. He specifically identifies Megacleides²⁸ and Chamaeleon in his list as Peripatetics, between several older historians and several later grammarians. Tatian identifies specific attempts to date Homer that he associates with several other authors, and then adds,

some said that he lived before the Olympiads, that is four hundred years after the capture of Ilium, while others brought down the time, and said that Homer had been contemporary with Archilochus; now Archilochus flourished about the twenty-third Olympiad, in the time of Gyges king of Lydia, five hundred years after the Trojan war.

Could Chamaeleon have dated Homer before the Olympiads, to the beginning of the 8th century, or to the time of Archilochus, in the mid 7th-century? Modern scholarship tends to date Homer (or at least the written composition of the Homeric epics) somewhere in the middle, after the beginning of the Olympiads, but not as late as Archilochus. What Tatian suggests, however, is that Chamaeleon discussed Homer's life, as well as poetry, which is something we do not get from any other source.²⁹ We have no title of Chamaeleon referring to a work on Homer; *scholia* refer instead to his work *On the Iliad*, both the first book and the fifth.

²⁸ Megacleides' *On Homer* is cited several times in the Homeric *scholia* and once in Photius, without his being referred to as a Peripatetic.

²⁹ **16** is not as explicit as it might be that Chamaeleon wrote a work whose title was *On Homer* as opposed to writings dealing with Homer (and Hesiod).

In a scholium on Apollonius (23), we see Chamaeleon reporting that “Idmon,” the name of the seer in Apollonius’ *Argonautica*, is a nickname of Thestor, the father of the Homeric seer Calchas, who is referred to as “son of Thestor” at the beginning of the *Iliad* (*Il.* 1.69). That this information is gleaned from book five of Chamaeleon’s *On the Iliad* suggests that Chamaeleon did not proceed, in commentary fashion, with issues at the beginning of the *Iliad* first. Chamaeleon’s explanation for the nickname, that Thestor was experienced, is left without further explanation. The name Idmon is presumably derived from the notion of sight ((*v*)*id*-), which would have been a divinely inspired trait, but the notion of “being experienced” suggests that his abilities as a seer were somehow based on experience rather than on divine inspiration. Perhaps there is further reference to adventures before the Argonautic expedition. At any rate, Idmon is said, by Apollonius, to have gone on the Argonautic expedition despite knowing that he would be killed on it. Perhaps the reference to his being experienced is associated with his being older, in which case his self-sacrifice would not seem as striking.³⁰

Although he is not a seer Polydamas correctly interprets an omen of Zeus in book 12 of the *Iliad* and gives advice to Hector, which Hector rejects. In 18 the scholiast combines the name of Chamaeleon with that of Zenodotus and refers only to an orthographical question: since the form of the name that is discussed by the scholiast is in the vocative case, it seems unlikely that Chamaeleon was discussing the role of Polydamas, although it is possible. The analogy referred to by the scholiast is to the name Leodamas, (cf. *Od.* 8.153), but mss. and editors are split over whether the *nu* should appear there also. We may note that Aristotle in the *Poetics* touches on a vocative when he briefly mentions the very beginning of the *Iliad*. He responds there to Protagoras’ criticism of Homer that the poem begins with a command, “sing, goddess, the wrath,” rather than a prayer (*Poet.* 1456b16-17). The comparison does not show much, except that Aristotle, like Chamaeleon, might record a vocative form from Homer without intending to make any point about spelling.

19 In book 19 of the *Iliad*, Achilles reflects on the anger that he has vented toward Agamemnon: “Not so many Achaeans would have bitten

³⁰ There may also be a reference to the expedition of the Seven against Thebes, whose seer Amphiaraus similarly knew that he, as well as his companions, would be killed (cf. Eur., *Suppl.* 158, Apollod. 3.6.1).

the vast surface of the ground, while I was raging” (19.62). As the first word of the poem, rage (*menis*) of course has crucial thematic importance for the *Iliad*. It is clearly related to *orgê*, which Aristotle describes at some length in *Rhet.* 2.2. It seems reasonable to say that *menis* is a destructive sort of anger. Aristotle’s definition of anger entails that it should be directed at someone as a result of a particular act, or acts. Chamaeleon’s form *epimenisantos* seems likewise to suggest an object for the rage, whereas the word with the prefix *apo-* might not, although in fact it can.³¹ Chamaeleon’s reading may imply that Achilles’ rage was directed particularly at Agamemnon, but the only other appearance of the form, *Il.* 13.460, makes the object of the anger explicit; in that case it is Priam. Here, where Agamemnon is present, Chamaeleon may see a need to point toward the implied object of the anger more than simply to see rage being vented out.

20 The differences of opinion between Aristotle and Chamaeleon over Zeus’ delight in seeing the other gods join in battle and strife seem those of emphasis rather than substance. Aristotle defends Zeus on the grounds that while Zeus enjoys this particular skirmish among the gods, he does not, like Ares, constantly delight in battle. Chamaeleon criticizes Zeus nevertheless: the gods’ battle is not something good (and so worthy to be delighted in) but absurd, since the gods, as immortals, cannot really hurt each other anyway. This text is significant in a number of ways.³² First, it deals with a substantive issue of Homeric interpretation and not just with orthography. Second, it takes as its starting point an interpretation of the text by Aristotle. The scholiast does not say explicitly that Chamaeleon was reacting against Aristotle, but that seems entirely possible. If so, we may wonder whether Chamaeleon’s work on Homer generally took this form, namely, engagement with the Aristo-

³¹ Erbse on *Iliad* 7.230 cites Heraclides of Miletus (fr.2) saying that the two expressions are equivalent.

³² Podlecki (1969) 120 interprets the text as follows: “Aristotle had attempted to reconcile Zeus’ rebuke of Ares at the end of *Iliad* 5 for the latter’s fondness for strife and battle, with the tolerant stance Zeus himself takes in *Iliad* 21 towards the contention among the gods on Olympus. The gist of Aristotle’s defense seems to have been that Zeus himself rebuked Ares not because the latter liked the occasional good fight (like the gods’ battle in Book 21), but that he did so invariably ... Chamaeleon was having none of this; he blamed Zeus for neglect of duty, *to ethelokakon*, and found the divine battle in 21 ‘extremely strange’. He apparently went on ... to defend the scene on grounds that the gods were striving *peri aretês*, and were in no danger, as they would have been if they had been mortals.”

telian *Aporrhemata Homerica* or at any rate with the sorts of questions that Aristotle dealt with in that work.

The striking use of the military term for willful inaction or failure (*to ethelokakon*) in **20** seems to allow no precise explanation. Chamaeleon is the first author before the third century to use even this idea, let alone this form of it (with the substantival article), except for Herodotus, who uses only the verbal form of it and only in military contexts. Even among later authors, this usage is exceptional. If it is accurately reported here, it suggests some striking ideas in Chamaeleon's literary analysis, not just a novel ethical concept borrowed from the military sphere but one applied to a god, Zeus no less. The scholiast cites Chamaeleon as criticizing Zeus, but of course this may be short-hand for a criticism of Homer. Chamaeleon goes on to another novel analysis in criticizing the gods' competition over *aretê* because they are not really risking their lives. Again, this may be a criticism of the gods, of Homer, or even of Aristotle, who made an issue of Zeus' pleasure in seeing the gods fight in *Iliad* 21.

Although the scholiasts are right in **21A-B** that the term "honored head" is used as a term of address for an older person and that Patroclus is older than Achilles (cf. *Il.* 11.787), it hardly seems "laughable" (*geloion*) for Achilles to use the term "divine head" of his deceased friend, since the term "divine" has many more connotations than simply "immortal."³³ Moreover, at *Il.* 10.415, Hector is said to be holding council by the tomb of the *theios* Ilus, and we might presume, since he has a tomb, that *theios* Ilus is likewise dead. Chamaeleon's single syllable form allows metrically for the presence of the interjection *ô*, which he may have taken to be more polite or passionate than the vocative alone. Again, we should note the vocative, as in **18**, the only time *kephalê* appears in the vocative, although it is quite a common word in the *Iliad*.

Regarding **22A-B** Wehrli claims that Chamaeleon concludes from *Iliad* 23 itself that chestnut-colored horses with a spot of white on their heads are best,³⁴ but that would seem quite a limited job of literary interpretation, both on the part of Chamaeleon and of the scholiast. White facial markings are common in all equine types. Pindar, *Pythian* 4.205, refers to a herd of chestnut-colored cattle, also with the suggestion that they are very valuable. Note that Theophrastus 652 FHS&G, on *Il.*

³³ LSJ 3.

³⁴ Wehrli 1969² 77.

23.269, also involves assessing the values of the prizes in Patroclus' funeral games. The Peripatetics seem to have taken a great interest in the funeral games' prizes.

In **24A-B** Aristotle and Chamaeleon appear together in substituting the word *oudeessan*, meaning “earthly,” for *audeessan*, meaning “using speech.” The sound of the two words is very similar, so it is unclear whether the Peripatetics made the change purposefully or inadvertently. Presumably any goddess could have speech if she wanted it, so it is unclear why Homer or Aristophanes would see the need to distinguish them from dumb animals. Some goddesses, however, are clearly primarily celestial, as opposed to earth-bound, so the Peripatetic word seems to offer more contrast. On the other hand, the word *oudeessan* is not attested except in this context, so it would appear that Aristotle and Chamaeleon coined it, basing it on the well attested Homeric word *oudas* (“earth”).

With regard to **17**, Arrian 5.1 and Strabo 15.1.7-8 both discuss the connections between Dionysus and Nysa, the former discussing a city by that name that Alexander the Great encountered when traveling through Afghanistan (“India” in an ancient context). Theophrastus, *Hist. plant.* 4.4 has similar information, about Dionysus, ivy, and Alexander, but refers to the mountain as “Meros.” Chamaeleon is likely to have connected this research with the story of Lycurgus (*Iliad* 6.128-139), who attacked Dionysus when the infant god and his nurses were on Mount Nysa.

In almost all of the Chamaeleon texts associated with Homeric epic, Aristotle is either mentioned alongside Chamaeleon or the information in the text can be closely associated with a text of Aristotle or of another Peripatetic, such as Theophrastus. We may conclude that Chamaeleon's research on Homer was conducted within the context of discussions among members of the Peripatos but that he felt free to adopt distinct views and indeed to adopt new bases of literary analysis.

Works cited

- Arrighetti, G. 1987. *Poeti, eruditi e biografì: Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura* (Pisa: Giardini).
- Czapo, E., Miller, M., 2007. *The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama* (Cambridge: University Press).

- Depew, D. 2007. "From Hymn to Tragedy: Aristotle's Genealogy of Poetic Kinds," in Czapo - Miller (2007): 126-149.
- Friedrich, R. 1996. "Everything to do with Dionysus? Ritualism, the Dionysiac, and the Tragic," in Silk (1996): 257-283.
- Goldolphin, F.R.B. 1932. "A Note on the Technique of Ancient Biography," *CP* 27: 275-801.
- Kirkwood, G.M. 1988. Review of Arrighetti (1987), *AJP* 109: 602-605.
- Köpke, E. 1856. *De Chamaeleontis Heracleotae vita librorumque reliquiis* (Berolini: Hertz).
- Leo, F. 1901. *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1990. "Problems of Early Greek Tragedy: Pratinas and Phrynichus," in *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford: University Press): 225-237.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. 1962². *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Podlecki, A.J. 1969. "The Peripatetics as Literary Critics," *Phoenix* 23: 114-137.
- Schorn, S. 2004. *Satyros aus Kallatis, Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Scullion, S. 2002. "'Nothing to do with Dionysus': Tragedy Misconceived as Ritual," *CQ* 52: 102-137.
- Silk, M., ed. 1996. *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford: University Press).
- Steinhardt, M. 2007. "From Ritual to Narrative," in Czapo - Miller (2007): 196-220.
- Taplin, O. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford: University Press).
- Wehrli, F. 1969². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 9. *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes* (Basel - Stuttgart : Schwabe).
- West, M.L. 1989. "The Early History of Attic Tragedy," *CQ* 39: 251-254.
- Winkler, J.J., Zeitlin, F.I., eds. 1990. *Nothing to do with Dionysus: Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton: University Press).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

6

Chamaeleon: Biography and Literature *Peri tou deina**

Stefan Schorn

I. Introduction: Friedrich Leo's characterization of Chamaeleon's works *Peri tou deina*

The aim of this paper is to define the literary character of Chamaeleon's works of the type "*Peri tou deina*" ("On so-and-so") more accurately than previous scholarship has done and to reconsider his specific way of working. By works of this type I understand books bearing the title *Peri* + personal name in the genitive, as distinct from such having titles like *Bios* + personal name in the genitive.¹ I will come back later to those groups of literary works.

Chamaeleon's name can be found in almost every history of Greek biography. Yet sometimes the only reason for this is that the so-called "method of Chamaeleon" is characteristic of ancient literary biography

* A German version of this paper was published under the title "Chamaeleon: Biographie und Schriften *Peri tou deina*" in *Studi Classici e Orientali* 53, 2007 [= 2010, 31-65]. I would like to thank the editor of SCO, Cesare Letta, for the permission to publish the English version in this place.

¹ Cf. LSJ s.v. δείνα, ὁ, ἡ, τὸ, gen. δείνος, dat. δείνι, acc. δείνα, etc. indecl. (...) "such an one, so-and-so." I follow here the terminology established by Leo (1904).

more generally.² When he is discussed in this context, authors usually stress that his works were not biographies in the strict sense but exegetical and literary historical treatises in which biographical aspects also played a role.³ Admittedly, sometimes one can also read about “Chamaeleon’s biographies,” but those interpreters do not say why Chamaeleon’s books are to be regarded as biographies and not as works of literary criticism, and it seems that the term “biography” is not used by them in a strictly terminological way but rather designates “works in which biographical elements can be found.”⁴

Among the interpreters who explicitly deny that Chamaeleon’s works of the *Peri tou deina* type were biographies is also his most recent commentator, David Giordano.⁵ For this assessment he bases himself on the authority of Friedrich Leo’s fundamental and, as a whole, not yet replaced monograph *Die griechische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* (1901)⁶ and on an article by the same Leo, published immediately after the *editio princeps* of the papyrus that contains the fragments of Didymus’ *On Demosthenes*. Influenced by the new text, Leo gives a characterization of the literary genre *Peri tou deina* or, as is sometimes held, shows himself to be the discoverer of it.⁷

In his monograph, Leo develops his concept of the genre *Peri tou deina* by interpreting the fragments of Chamaeleon:⁸ On the basis of the titles of Chamaeleon’s works, which follow the tradition established

² On that method, see below.

³ In that sense e.g. Momigliano (1993) 70, 73; Camassa (1994) 316; in Sonnabend’s monograph (2002) Chamaeleon’s name does not appear, and Stuart (1928), too, does not discuss his works. It is interesting to see how creatively Wehrli (1968) refers in his article in the *Realenzyklopädie* to Chamaeleon’s works: after calling them once “Biographie,” he clearly avoids this designation and speaks of “literaturgeschichtliche Schriften,” “selbständige Publikationen über Alkman,” “Dichtermonographien,” “Schrift über Alkman,” “Pindarmonographie” etc. In his edition (Wehrli [1967-78] IX 75) he speaks on the one hand of “Dichterbiographie” and on the other hand quotes with agreement Leo’s assessment of Chamaeleon’s works as it can be found in the monograph of 1901.

⁴ This seems to be the case in Privitera (1965) 51: “Nelle sue biografie egli si proponeva di ricostruire la personalità dei singoli poeti basandosi sui loro scritti e sulle testimonianze di autori precedenti.” (but with reference to Leo!).

⁵ Giordano (1990) 13-7.

⁶ Leo (1901) 85ss.

⁷ Leo (1904); Pfeiffer (1978) 183 n. 147 regards Leo as the *Entdecker* of the genre as does Bagordo (1998) 28.

⁸ Leo (1901) 104-7.

by previous authors like Aristotle and Heraclides Ponticus, Leo denies that Chamaeleon tried to reconstruct the “story of a man, his ancestry, youth and development. The titles rather suggest research on the poets and their poems.”⁹ He nevertheless admits that these works “focused essentially on personality,” but adds that “they can be considered only as some kind of literary biography in the way Aristotle’s *On Poets* can.”¹⁰ Chamaeleon, he emphasizes, is not quoted by later authors for the *genos* or the basic facts of a life, but only for character traits, anecdotes, and innovations (*heurêmata*). In addition, Chamaeleon does not use evidence other than the works of the poets about whom he is writing, except when the comic playwright Aristophanes is his source in one fragment (44). Instead, he infers actions and experiences of the poets from passages in their poems. In almost every case one can see that biographical information goes back to passages in their works. In addition, Leo seems to doubt that 15 implies that Chamaeleon also treated the provenance and life of Homer. Instead he highlights his exegesis of single passages of Homer’s epics. Unlike Aristoxenus’ *Bioi*, “Chamaeleon’s writings contain in the form of interpretations what could be inferred from their poems about the personalities of the poets and their milieus.”¹¹ In the case of the tragedian Thespis (41), as Leo points out, Chamaeleon did not write a formal biography but tried to “gain access to the earliest history of tragedy by using contemporary evidence that he regarded as authentic, and in so doing, to grasp the author’s personality.”¹² The criterion for selecting an author was that “the framework of his biography had not yet been established” by previous research.¹³

On this characterization is based what Leo later, after his publication of Didymus’ commentary *On Demosthenes*, sets forth both on the books *Peri tou deina* in general and on those of Chamaeleon in particular.¹⁴ On the basis of the identical structure of the title, he assumes that Didymus’ *On Demosthenes* and Chamaeleon’s works *Peri tou deina* had an identical literary form. He emphasizes again their differ-

⁹ Leo (1901) 105.

¹⁰ Leo (1901) 105.

¹¹ Leo (1901) 107.

¹² Leo (1901) 107.

¹³ Leo (1901) 107.

¹⁴ Leo (1904) esp. 257-60 = (1960) 390-4; cf. already Casaubon, in Schweighäuser (1801-7) IV 77.

ence from Aristoxenus' biographies and considers as characteristic of them "that from single passages of the poems conclusions were drawn concerning actions, experiences, and character traits of the poet, and that some kind of personal-factual interpretation of the poems formed the basis of such a work."¹⁵ Referring to **39**, he regards Chamaeleon's books as commentaries, in which Chamaeleon's interpretations of verses from poems could be found under different *lemmata*. He thus assumes the same literary form as in Didymus' work. He cautiously adds that because of the very general character of a title like *Peri tou deina* it is not necessary that all such books had the form of a commentary. But he emphasizes: "On the other side, the fragments make it clear that books of that title, in addition to personal matters, biographical matters, questions of literary history and facts in general, also dealt with definitions of single words."¹⁶ Books *Peri tou deina* were different from the *hypomnemata* of later times in that they could be read without the work they commented on being alongside. In addition, their authors laid claim to artistry and, unlike the authors of *hypomnemata*, did not interpret the complete text but "only the passages that were relevant to the man and his historical environment."¹⁷

II. *Bioi* and works *Peri tou deina*

The scholarly debate concerning Leo's book, not yet concluded even today, has in many instances made clear one specific weakness of his approach: he often assumes fixed and uniform literary forms which fall short of the sometimes loose and creative use that Greek authors made of them.¹⁸ It therefore seems appropriate to ask whether antiquity really distinguished strictly between biographies in a strict sense and works *Peri tou deina*.

Leo is well aware that the title *Peri tou deina* allows a wide variety of content, but he seems reluctant to admit the possibility that such works could have been biographies in a strict sense. In order to decide whether

¹⁵ Leo (1904) 257 = (1960) 390.

¹⁶ Leo (1904) 257-8 = (1960) 391.

¹⁷ Leo (1904) 259 = (1960) 392.

¹⁸ Suffice it to say that his fundamental distinction between Peripatetic and Alexandrian biography was proven wrong long ago, although it still appears in literature from time to time.

in antiquity the content of biographies was strictly different from that of works *Peri tou deina* two things are necessary. On the one hand we have to clarify what biography was like in antiquity, i.e. establish its characteristics regarding form and content. On the other hand, the same has to be done for books of the *Peri tou deina* type, especially for those of Chamaeleon. That will be done in the present section. Concerning biography I will limit myself to works entitled *Bioi* and in particular those of poets.¹⁹ There exists some preliminary work by previous scholars, but no systematic study. As for the literature *Peri tou deina*, the situation is much worse. There are basically only Leo's treatments and a few more recent contributions, which modify or criticize certain aspects of his theory.²⁰ But not even Leo tried to collect the complete bulk of this kind of work, which is preserved mostly in fragments, to scrutinize the evidence and, thus, to establish the characteristics and possibly development of this form of literature – not even for those works dealing with poets. Hence, I have tried to do that, with the focus on works on poets, but I am quite convinced I have overlooked some evidence.²¹ In the following I will only summarize the results of my study.

¹⁹ When modern interpreters speak of biography in antiquity, they often start from characteristics of modern biography and, on this basis, try to figure out which works of antiquity can be regarded as biographies. My approach starts with the ancient concepts. Although there can be found theories of historiography in antiquity, there does not seem to have existed one that dealt with the description of the life of a single person. But of course such works were written and they were usually entitled *Bioi*. Considering this group of works as a “genre” one can establish its characteristics and then ask which works bearing other types of titles show identical or similar characteristics.

²⁰ Especially Leo's strict distinction between works *Peri tou deina* and *hypomnēmata* has been criticized; see West (1970) 290-1; Theodoridis (1972) 32-3; cf. Bagordo (1998) 46 n. 81; against Leo's distinction between works *Peri biôn* and *Bioi* see Jacoby, *FGrHist* III b I (Text), 379 (on tit. no. 20). Arrighetti (1994) 238 disapproves of the conclusion Leo draws from the title *Peri tou deina* concerning the content of such books. On p. 212-6 he rightly stresses the closeness of “ricerca biografica” and “riflessione sulla letteratura” and the difficulty involved in distinguishing in the case of some Peripatetic writings whether they were “opere biografiche contenenti elementi di genuina critica letteraria” or rather “commentaries on poets”, seppure ricchi di dati biografici.” Most explicit is Gallo (1997) 161-4 who points out that some of these works were biographies.

²¹ Not all of these works are listed in Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. When only the titles have been preserved, Müller mentions them only in the introductory paragraphs to the collections of fragments, and even if there are some fragments, the works are not always marked by headings so that one is forced to read all the volumes completely. Some authors and their works are only mentioned *en passant*

First, the *Bioi*. Assembling the evidence of the *Bioi* of poets, one comes to a halt very quickly. Aside from some late compilations of the type *Genos kai bios tou deina*, I was able to find only the *Bios* of Telestes by Aristoxenus²² and the *Bioi* of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides by Satyrus.²³ Of Satyrus' *Bios Euripidou* substantial fragments have been preserved by *POxy*. 1176.²⁴ It is difficult to establish the typology of the genre on such a small textual basis. But what Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* has revealed and what may be contrary to our concept of biography is that a *Bios* could have the form of a dialogue and show a strong focus on literary criticism, including numerous quotations from the tragedies of Euripides.²⁵ For although the first part of the biography, which dealt with Euripides' dramatic art (*technê*), is for the most part lost, it is clear that literary criticism was very important in it. The second part is also made up mostly of interpretations of verses from Euripides' tragedies and from comedy of the 5th and 4th centuries as well as discussions of other quotations. They all serve to reconstruct events of Euripides' life, his character, interests and influence. The account follows only loosely the course of Euripides' life and the material is primarily arranged by subjects: Euripides and contemporary philosophy, Euripides and the demagogues, Euripides and his fellow poets, etc. It is evident that an exact reconstruction of his life, i.e., of the exact dates of events or of performances, was not intended. Only after a series of thematic sections does a concluding chapter follow that covers Euripides' withdrawal to Macedonia, some experiences there and his death, which in all likelihood was not even dated. This shows that the ancient *Bios* of a poet could, unlike a modern biography, contain a remarkable

in connection with homonyms, and the indices are incomplete. Of Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, the relevant volumes are still missing, and looking into the editions and collections of fragments of archaic poets, one realizes that their fragments have been collected repeatedly, but that for many poets no collections of *testimonia* exist where information on ancient works dealing with these poets could be found. Hence the interpreter has to start with handbooks and lexica. However, the selective collections of *testimonia* in the editions of early Greek poetry published in the *Loeb Classical Library* are very useful, as is Bagordo (1998) for dramatic poetry and Davies (1991) for Alcman, Stesichorus and Ibycus.

²² Aristoxenus fr. 117 Wehrli.

²³ Satyrus test. 3a; fr. 3-7 Schorn.

²⁴ *POxy*. 1176 = Satyrus F 6 Schorn; cf. Schorn (2004) on the following.

²⁵ Also the anonymous lives of tragedians that have been transmitted together with their works by medieval manuscripts show that feature to a certain degree.

mixture of both biographical data and exegesis of texts, and this picture is confirmed by the fragments of Satyrus' *Life of Sophocles* and the late *Bios kai genos* literature, mentioned above.²⁶ The strange character of Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* once induced Kurt Latte to see a connection to the *problēmata* literature.²⁷ Nevertheless one major difference needs to be emphasized: in the final analysis, in *Bioi* literary criticism and literary history always have a biographical orientation and aim at documenting aspects of the achievements, personality, and life of the poet, which is not the case in *problēmata* literature in general where problems are dealt with in their own right. Momigliano once defined biography as "[a]n account of the life of a man from birth to death."²⁸ As for the Greek *Bioi* of poets this characterization needs some modification: we have to be aware that within an only rough chronological frame, biographers were free to present the material in whatever way they wanted, even in dialogue form. They selected from tradition what they considered relevant and necessary for reconstructing the personality of the man rather than the course of his life.

Second, the *Peri tou deina* literature. A survey of the remains has indeed shown that many of these works were commentaries. In these cases, they are normally in several books, sometimes with each having a different sub-title indicating the single work which is commented on.²⁹ Nevertheless other works of this type were unambiguously biographical in the ancient sense of the term. Among them only the work known as *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* has been preserved completely. The Greek title in the manuscripts reads *Peri Homêrou kai Hêsiodou kai tou genous kai agônos autôn*. It is a "parallel life" with a focus on the contest.³⁰ *POxy.* 1800 is also an interesting case. It contains a collec-

²⁶ On this aspect cf. Arrighetti (1994).

²⁷ This orally expressed thesis of Latte's is referred to by Dihle (1970²) 105 n. 1.

²⁸ Momigliano (1993) 11.

²⁹ E.g. in the case of Didymus' *De Demosthene*. In the papyrus that transmits it, the title reads: Διδύμου Περί Δημοσθένους κη Φιλιππικῶν γ. For an interpretation of the title see Harding (2006) 4-20; cf. Apollodorus of Athens, Περί Ἐπιχάρμου (in at least six books) (*FGrHist* 244 F 213 = fr. 8 Bagordo) and Περί Σώφρονος (in at least four books) (*FGrHist* 244 F 214-8 = fr. 9-14 Bagordo); probably also Sosibius, Περί Ἀλκμᾶνος (in at least three books) (*FGrHist* 595 F 6).

³⁰ Pseudo-Plutarch's *De Homero* has to remain out of consideration because the title differs in the manuscripts, some of which have Περί Ὀμήρου and others Ὀμήρου βίος. Yet this discrepancy supports the thesis, argued for below, that in antiquity no strict distinction was made between *Bioi* and books *Peri tou deina*.

tion of short biographies of poets (including a biography of Sappho in which text **29** is quoted). All bear titles of the *Peri tou deina* type, and Lamedica has shown that the texts are epitomes of originally much longer accounts in which the lives and personalities of the poets were reconstructed according to the “method of Chamaeleon.”³¹ Furthermore, Hermippus’ books on various kinds of people had titles of the *Peri tou deina* type, but they were biographies in the ancient sense of the word.³² It may be added that in ancient literature identical works are sometimes referred to as *Bioi* and sometimes as works *Peri tou deina*.³³ That, too, makes clear that ancient authors did not see a fundamental difference between the two types and that works of the *Peri tou deina* type could have corresponded to biographies in the Greek sense of the word.

Another remark on the *Peri tou deina* literature may be added. A focus on the facts of a life, which is characteristic of biography today, but not necessarily of that in ancient Greece, can surprisingly be found in a work *Peri tou deina*. I mean Neanthes’ *Peri endoxôn andrôn*, where the author from Cyzicus zeroes in on chronological aspects of the lives of his heroes with historical acumen.³⁴ Even though many questions regarding the character of Neanthes’ works remain open due to its fragmentary state of preservation, it is quite probable that they came close to what we today understand by biography.

III. The character of Chamaeleon’s works *Peri tou deina*

In this section, I shall address Leo’s views on Chamaeleon’s works of the *Peri tou deina* type. In addition, I shall analyze some of their characteristics that were not discussed by Leo. To anticipate the most important result

³¹ Lamedica (1985). Gallo (1997) 161-4 is right in classifying POxy. 1800 and the works of Hermippus as biographies.

³² On Hermippus, see Bollansée (1999).

³³ E.g. Aristoxenus fr. 11b Wehrli = Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.14.62.2: ἐν τῷ Πυθαγόρου βίῳ, but fr. 14 = Diog. Laert. 1.118: ἐν τῷ Περὶ Πυθαγόρου καὶ τῶν γνωρίμων αὐτοῦ and fr. 25 = Gell. 4.11.4: *in libro, quem de Pythagora reliquit*; Antig. Car. fr. 2a Dorandi = Diog. Laert. 9.62: ἐν τῷ Περὶ Πύρρωνος, but fr. 4a = Aristocles ap. Euseb. praep. ev. 14.18.26: Ἀντίγονος ... ἀναγράψας τὸν βίον φησὶ τὸν Πύρρωνα ...; Antig. Car. fr. 34a = Athen. 13.607e: ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ζήνωνος, but fr. 35a = Athen. 13.603e: ἐν τῷ Ζήνωνος βίῳ.

³⁴ On Neanthes’ works, see Schorn (2007).

of this examination: neither form nor content preclude that Chamaeleon's works were biographies of poets in the Greek sense of the word.

1. Title and Form

Let us come back to Leo's fundamental assumption that we can infer the literary form from the title. That this is not possible in the case of *Bioi* and works *Peri tou deina* was shown in [section II](#). It may be helpful to learn that in 1901 and 1904, when Leo published his studies, some of the texts which make this clear had not yet been published, for example, *POxy.* 1800 containing the epitomes of lives of poets, each titled *Peri tou deina* (published in 1922), and, above all, Satyrus' *Bios Euripidou*, preserved in *POxy.* 1176 (published in 1912). Although Leo published an interpretation of the latter text immediately on its publication, which contributed decisively to its understanding,³⁵ he did not draw any conclusions from it as far as his concept of *Peri tou deina* literature was concerned, and the same is true of his general ideas on the development of Hellenistic biography, which were in part proven wrong by that text.

2. Chamaeleon's works as commentaries?

Leo considered the way in which the material is presented as a fundamental difference between Chamaeleon's works and Satyrus' *Life of Euripides*.³⁶ Of course, he was also aware of the similarities in the method applied by both authors to extract biographical information from poetry as well as the focus on literary criticism in the *Life of Euripides*. He classified the presentation in Chamaeleon as "inductive" (*induktiv*) since here the verses of an author are quoted first and followed by an analysis. Satyrus' account he called "deductive" (*deduktiv*) for there the biographical fact is stated first and followed by the verses that "prove" its historicity and – it needs to be added – from which it has been extrapolated.³⁷

³⁵ Leo (1912).

³⁶ Leo (1912) 276 = (1960) 368-9; on Leo's concept, see Arrighetti (1987) 144-5.

³⁷ "Wenn man sich ein Buch *περὶ Εὐριπίδου* in Chamaeleons Stil vorstellt und die inductive Methode in die deductive umkehrt, so dass statt der Untersuchung mit den Folgerungen die Resultate mit den Belegen auftreten, so hat man das Buch des Satyros." Leo (1912) 276 = (1960) 369.

Text **39** is Leo's principal witness for assuming that Chamaeleon's works were commentaries:

Χαμαιλέων δ' ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος προθεῖς τὸ
 ξανθῇ δ' Εὐρυπύλῃ μέλει
 ὁ περιφόρητος Ἀρτέμων, (fr. 27 [372] Page = 8 Gentili)
 τὴν προσηγορίαν ταύτην λαβεῖν τὸν Ἀρτέμωνα διὰ τὸ τρυφερῶς
 βιοῦντα περιφέρεισθαι ἐπὶ κλίνης.

Leo is right in pointing out that Didymus uses *προθεῖς* regularly in his *On Demosthenes* to introduce quotations from Philochorus, so for example in col. I 14-5: *προθεῖς ἄρχοντα Σωσ[ι]γέ[ι]νη φησὶ ταῦτα* (sc. Philochorus = *FGrHist* 328 F 159). According to his theory, Leo inferred from the analogous title (*Peri tou deina*) an analogous content, and since he interpreted *προθεῖς* in Didymus as “under the lemma,” he concluded that Chamaeleon's works must have been commentaries. However, *προθεῖς* in Didymus is to be interpreted rather as “under the heading,” i.e. in the chapter that recorded the events of this archonship.³⁸ Athenaeus, who transmits **39**, uses *προθεῖς* with different meanings. It can mean “to write under a lemma (in a commentary),”³⁹ but also “to set out first”⁴⁰ and “to quote before,” the latter in 3.84b where he reports verses of the comic poet Antiphanes, which his colleague Eriphus quoted without naming his source, adding some verses of his own.⁴¹ The usage by Athenaeus shows that *προθεῖς* can mean any kind of mention, account, or quotation that comes before an explanation or addition.⁴² It is therefore not necessary to assume in Chamaeleon *lemmata* consisting

³⁸ Cf. Harding (2006) 104.

³⁹ Ath. 3.89a: Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Σώφρονος προθεῖς τὰ “λιχνοτέρα τῶν πορφυρᾶν” φησὶν ... (followed by the explanation of the proverb) (Apollodorus, *FGrHist* 244 fr. 216); Ath. 7.281e: Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ Περὶ Σώφρονος τῷ εἰς τοὺς ἀνδρείους μίμους προθεῖς τὸ “καταπυγοτέρα τ' ἀλφιστᾶν” φησιν ... (followed by the explanation) (Apollodorus, *FGrHist* 244 fr. 214); Athen. 11.468e-f: Φιλήμων δ' ἐν τοῖς Ἀπτικοῖς Ὀνόμασιν ἢ Γλώτταις προθεῖς “καλπίς” φησι ... (followed by the explanation); Athen. 11.493c-d: Σωσίβιος δ' ὁ λυτικὸς προθεῖς τὰ ἔπη “ἄλλος μὲν ...” γράφει κατὰ λέξιν (followed by the explanation) (*FGrHist* 595 F 26).

⁴⁰ Ath. 9.410a: ... ὡς καὶ Κλείδημος ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Ἐξηγητικῷ. προθεῖς γὰρ περὶ ἐναγισμῶν γράφει τάδε ... (Clidemus, *FGrHist* 323 fr. 14).

⁴¹ Antiphanes fr. 59 Kassel-Austin = Eriphus fr. 2 Kassel-Austin.

⁴² Cf. LSJ, s.v. προτίθημι II 4 and IV 1; cf. Josephus in Ap. 1.185 introducing Ps.-Hecataeus *de Iud.* (*FGrHist* 264 F 21).

of verses and followed by commentaries. Χαμαιλέων ... προθείς may just mean that Chamaeleon first quoted the verses and subsequently gave an interpretation of them. That way of working can be found often, but not always, in his works, as will be shown in the following. Hence, προθείς does not prove that Chamaeleon's books were commentaries, and there is clear evidence that excludes this possibility. Despite the claim of Leo there are some cases of "deductive" presentation of the data. In text **27** two facts are stated first (Alcman as inventor of erotic poetry and in love with Megalostrate) and in the following documented by quotations. The same is the case in **44**, where the thesis that Aeschylus was the first tragedian who was also choreographer precedes the verses which are supposed to prove that claim and from which the information has been derived.⁴³ Unless we assume that Athenaeus, our source also of these two fragments, has rearranged the text that he had found in Chamaeleon, these fragments are inconsistent with the idea of Chamaeleon's works being commentaries.

Crucial for Chamaeleon's working method and the literary form of his books is the long fragment **34**, transmitted once more by Athenaeus.⁴⁴ Chamaeleon reports the Corinthian custom to invite as many prostitutes as possible to join the prayers and to be later present at the sacrifices whenever the city prays to Aphrodite in highly important matters. As evidence he refers to the prayers of the Corinthian prostitutes during the Persian wars. He explains that after the Greek victory the Corinthians dedicated a picture of these prostitutes in the temple of Aphrodite "which is preserved even to this day,"⁴⁵ and that Simonides composed an epigram in their honor, which he quotes.⁴⁶ He adds that "even private citizens vow to the goddess that, if those things for which they make petition are fulfilled, they will even render courtesans to her." That was done by Xenophon of Corinth, a winner at the Olympic Games, for whom Pindar composed the victory ode⁴⁷ and the *scolium*⁴⁸ for the sacrificial feast which was also attended by the prostitutes donated by him. Chamaeleon documents this custom among private citizens with

⁴³ On the text and interpretation of **44**, see Schorn (2008) 69-70, 76-8.

⁴⁴ On the delimitation of the fragment, see Schorn (2008) 74-6.

⁴⁵ All translations of **34** are taken from volume VI of C. B. Gulick's Loeb-edition of Athenaeus.

⁴⁶ Simonides epigr. 14 [732-735] Page.

⁴⁷ Pind. Ol. 13.

⁴⁸ Pind. fr. 122 Snell-Maehler.

some verses from that *scolium*. Subsequently he also quotes the beginning of the poem, where Pindar addresses the prostitutes directly. But Chamaeleon adds that since such an address seemed bold to the poet he declared, “and yet I wonder what the lords of the Isthmus will say of me, seeing that I have devised such a prelude as this to a song with honeyed words, linking myself with common women.” But full of confidence he straightway declared: “We have taught how to test gold by a pure touchstone.”⁴⁹

A look into any edition of Pindar will show that the order of verses differs from that in Chamaeleon. There, the poem begins, following Chamaeleon’s explicit statement, with πολύξεναι νεάνιδες, and the text is preserved without interruption until σὺν δ’ ἀνάγκῃ πᾶν καλόν. Then three verses are missing and after the lacuna follow the third strophe (ἀλλὰ θαυμάζω ... ξυναῖς γυναιξί) and the first line of the fourth strophe (ἐδιδάξαμεν ... βασάνῳ). After another lacuna (of perhaps no more than one verse) we find the verses that are quoted first by Chamaeleon (ὦ Κύπρου ... ἰανθείς). In the following only a few concluding verses seem to be lost.⁵⁰

This text of Chamaeleon does not look like a commentary. The fact that for reasons of argumentation he did not quote the verses in their original order excludes that possibility. But even assuming that Athenaeus has changed Chamaeleon’s text (although such an assumption has little to recommend itself), it is improbable that it comes from a commentary, for Chamaeleon obviously quoted almost the complete poem. We would have to assume that the book was a commented edition, and not a commentary. But that Chamaeleon composed such works is not attested and cannot be inferred from the other fragments.

In addition, **28**, which comes from *On Sappho*, cannot originate from a commentary on the poems of the poetess either. Referring to unspecified sources Chamaeleon quotes verses by Anacreon which allegedly document

⁴⁹ On the interpretation of this verse, see Schmitz (1970) 32: “Nimmt man nun auch die Prüfstein-Metapher ernst, so kann man sagen: eben dadurch hat sich seine Dichtung als lauterer Gold erwiesen, dass sie auch dieses Thema brillant bewältigen kann.” Cf. Van Groningen (1960) 37: “nous (les poètes en général, et moi en particulier) nous disposons d’une pierre de touche infaillible qui nous permet de montrer à d’autres ce qui est or pur.”

⁵⁰ On what might have been lost of Pindar poem, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922) 375; Van Groningen (1960) 21-2; see also the editions of Cecil M. Bowra (1947²) (fr. 107), Alexander Turyn (1958) (fr. 130), Bruno Snell/Herwig Maehler (1989) (fr. 122), William H. Race (1997) (fr. 122).

his unrequited love to the poetess, and verses by which Sappho is said to have addressed Anacreon. If *On Sappho* had been a commentary, one of the poems that were commented on would have been the latter, a *pseudepigraphon* (fr. *adesp.* 35 [953] Page) on which Chamaeleon himself remarks that it is plain to everybody that it is not by Sappho.⁵¹

3. Use of evidence outside the works of the poets

According to Leo, Chamaeleon derived all his biographical and literary historical data on the poets from their poetry and only once, in **44**, used Aristophanes as external evidence for the thesis that Aeschylus was the first tragedian who was at the same time the choreographer for his plays. Yet it can be added that also in **45**, which is most probably from *On Aeschylus*,⁵² Chamaeleon relies on evidence from comedy (Aristophanes or Plato Comicus) for the reconstruction of the history of dance in tragedy. Thus also comedy seems to have been an important source of information. How can we imagine this kind of information which obviously is not connected with verses of the tragedian in a lemmatized commentary?

Similarly, **41** from *On Thespis* is unlikely to stem from a commentary on that tragedian. In the 4th century BC hardly any remains of his tragedies still existed, although it cannot be excluded that in works of literary criticism like that of Glaucus of Rhegium single verses or passages had been preserved.⁵³ Hence what verses could have been interpreted by Chamaeleon in a commentary *On Thespis*?⁵⁴ According to Aristoxenus, Heraclides Ponticus forged tragedies using Thespis' name (**16**).⁵⁵ Will Chamaeleon have commented on those *pseudepigrapha*? Probably not. If those tragedies really existed, it is quite improbable that

⁵¹ The commentary of Athenaeus (viz. of the speaker in the dialogue) only starts with ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι. Hence the words ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶ Σαπφούς τοῦτο τὸ ᾄσμα παντί που δῆλον are still part of the quotation from Chamaeleon, as notes Martano, **28** n. 1; cf. already Scorza (1934) 13 n. 2.

⁵² On the provenance of **45** from *On Aeschylus*, see Wehrli (1967-78) IX 86; Steffen (1964) 55-6; Giordano (1990) 180-1; Schorn (2008) 70. Martano **45** n. 2 is skeptical.

⁵³ Thus Lloyd-Jones (1990) 226-7. It has often been held by interpreters that Aristotle was no longer able to read Thespis' tragedies; cf. Rudberg (1947) 15-6.

⁵⁴ On the other side, one could expect more verses of Thespis' to be preserved if Chamaeleon had written a commentary on them.

⁵⁵ Aristoxenus fr. 114 Wehrli = Heraclides Ponticus fr. 181 Wehrli = 1 (92) Schütrumpf. Cf. Wehrli (1967-78) II 82-3; differently Lesky (1972) 50-1.

Chamaeleon was fooled, since he was carrying on a literary feud with Heraclides, whom he accused of plagiarizing his works on Hesiod and Homer. The only fragment from *On Thespis* deals with an innovation of the poet, and things like that are likely to have made up the bigger part of it. For if we have a look at the collection of *testimonia vitae et artis* in Snell's edition (*TrGF* 1) it becomes clear that of Thespis' life little was known or could be "reconstructed" by interpreting his fragments.⁵⁶ Chamaeleon was therefore probably concerned with inventions (*heurêmata*) and the position of Thespis within the history of tragedy, which was biographical in the ancient sense of the word. Writing a book on Thespis, Chamaeleon was forced to look for evidence outside the tragedies of his hero. Here too, it is hard to imagine that he was able to integrate this kind of information, for which there was obviously no evidence in the fragments of the poet, into a lemmatized commentary.

In addition, there are at least two fragments with biographical content that are based neither on the works of the poet nor on comedy. **36** presents Simonides as a quick-witted guest at the symposium. He responds with a parody on a verse of Homer when he is treated badly by his host. A similar situation is described by Callistratus. He reports an improvised epigram, an elegiac *griphos*,⁵⁷ by which Simonides points out during a symposium that unlike all the other guests he has not been given snow to cool his wine.⁵⁸ The situation is analogous to that in Chamaeleon: Simonides is neglected at the symposium and reacts as can be expected from a poet: with some witty verses.⁵⁹ But whereas the epigram quoted by Callistratus is also comprehensible without the anecdote into which it is embedded and may have existed independently, that is not the case with the parody on Homer found in Chamaeleon. It also does not appear to have been originally longer than that single verse. Context and quoted verse form an inseparable unity. It is therefore hardly possible that it is a verse on which Chamaeleon commented in a commentary. In addition, the *apophthegma* of Simonides that is

⁵⁶ Exceptions are test. 1, 14, 17 and 19.

⁵⁷ That is how Bartol (1998) characterizes the poem.

⁵⁸ Simonides epigr. 88 Page = fr. 25 West² = Callistratus, *FGrHist* 348 F 3. Molyneux (1992) 131 with n. 103 follows Boas (1905) 116 and Wehrli (1967-1978) IX 83 and sees in Chamaeleon or in a text used by both Chamaeleon and Callistratus the source of Callistratus.

⁵⁹ Cf. Christ (1941) 69-70.

quoted subsequently by Chamaeleon does not seem to go back to verses of that poet either.

Even more unambiguous examples of stories that are not the result of a biographical interpretation of poetry are the two anecdotes on Lasus of Hermione in **33**. Here we have two puns typically linked to him which were known as *lasismata*⁶⁰ and whose first emergence is usually dated as early as the 5th century BC⁶¹. One of the anecdotes can also be found among the fables of Aesop (246 Chambray). It is remarkable that in these popular narrations no verses are adduced to prove their historicity and that they are also not in any other way related to poetry. They were obviously not the result of an interpretation of poetry, and given their content it is hard to see how they could have been extrapolated from the choral lyric of Lasus.

Hence it cannot be doubted that Chamaeleon collected biographical data that was not related to the works of the poets. How he could have presented it in a commentary arranged by *lemmata* consisting of verses of the poets can hardly be explained.

4. The arrangement of the material

Because of the fragmentary state of preservation of Chamaeleon's works, it is not perfectly clear how he presented his material. Nevertheless, the somewhat longer fragments, which are transmitted by Athenaeus, give at least some hints. Taken together, they suggest that Chamaeleon displayed the information in sections arranged by topics: **33** contains probably a continuous text and seems to come from a section "*lasismata* on fish." Moreover, **36** is continuous but does not show with certainty whether in *On Simonides* the material was arranged chronologically or by topics.⁶² Both anecdotes in that fragment play at the time when Simonides lived at Hiero's court and document his greed. **27** appears to originate from a chapter "Alcman and sexuality." Based on his poems, his position in the history of poetry is defined: he was the creator of the genre "erotic poem." Subsequently a conclusion is drawn on this basis on his character in general and an object of his desire is named as a concrete example. A similar line of argument can be found in **43A**. Starting from the thesis that Aeschylus was the first

⁶⁰ Lasus test. 8 Brussich.

⁶¹ Thus Privitera (1965) 49-50; Giordano (1990) 165; Brussich (2000) 59.

⁶² On **36**, see Schorn (2008) 76.

tragedian to introduce drunkards on stage, which is to be classified as a literary historical statement and which is directed against previous scholarship, Chamaeleon issues the programmatic statement “what the tragedian did himself he also had his characters do,” and consequently draws a conclusion on Aeschylus’ personality: he always wrote poetry while he was drunk. This inference is corroborated by an illustrative anecdote. The topic here is “Aeschylus and wine/drunkenness.” Furthermore, the two riddles in **37** seem to originate from the same Ceian source. It is possible that the arrangement we find in Athenaeus goes back to Chamaeleon and that we have here the rest of a section devoted to “Simonidean riddles.”⁶³

It needs to be stressed that the presentation of the material in thematic sections does not rule out that Chamaeleon’s works were biographies, as it might seem to the modern reader. Not only in Suetonius’ *Lives of the Caesars*, but also in Satyrus’ *Life of Euripides* and elsewhere⁶⁴ we encounter this formal principle in biography, which seems to have been widespread in classical biography.

5. The so-called “method of Chamaeleon”⁶⁵

The exegetical approach called the “method of Chamaeleon” is typical for almost the complete field of literary biography in antiquity. It aims at reconstructing events of the lives of authors and their personality with the help of their literary production. Its basis is the idea that the character (*êthos*) of a man is reflected in his works and deeds (*erga*), part of which are his literary works.⁶⁶ A second feature of this method is that evidence from comedy is used to gain data on poets and other people. It has been generally assumed that it was Chamaeleon who used this method, which had been already applied long before his time, on a large scale to reconstruct the personalities of ancient poets and the history of early Greek literature. Yet it has not been noticed that in most cases in which biographical data are extrapolated from poetry in this

⁶³ On the riddles, see below, and Schorn (2008) 60-3.

⁶⁴ E.g. in Lucian’s *Life of Demonax* and in Philo’s *On the Life of Moses*.

⁶⁵ In this section, I present a summary of the results of my 2008 study of Chamaeleon. There the reader will find commentaries on the constitution of the texts and further interpretations.

⁶⁶ This paradigm of interpretation has been studied particularly by Graziano Arrighetti and Mary R. Lefkowitz who have contributed decisively to its understanding: Arrighetti (1987) esp. 141-190; Lefkowitz (1981), (1994); cf. now also Schorn (2008).

way, Chamaeleon refers to a source for these interpretations, which shows that he only reports these biographical interpretations but does not vouch for their historicity.⁶⁷ This is the case with the report on the love of Alcman for Megalostrate and his interest in women in general (27), for which Chamaeleon refers to “Archytas the harmonist.” This is probably the Pythagorean of Tarentum (* ca. 435-410; † 360-350) and not the almost unknown musician of Mytilene (not datable).⁶⁸ The story of Anacreon’s love for Sappho, supposedly documented by one of his songs, and the verses which Sappho is said to have addressed to her colleague (28) are told with reference to unspecified sources, and Chamaeleon appears to have noted that this interpretation must be considered as mistaken.⁶⁹ Hence we can rule out that he considered this chronologically impossible romance historical. Furthermore, Chamaeleon recounts different solutions to two riddles of Simonides by pointing to anonymous sources (37). Both explanations of the first riddle and the only one of the second one require a detailed knowledge of the topography and cult of Ceos and in all likelihood stem from that island. The verses are in a remarkable way interpreted as referring to certain cult practices on Ceos. We find at the same time, in the cult of the poet Archilochus practiced in his native Paros, the same tendency to link the great son to the cult of his home town. It seems therefore that this kind of exegesis of poets was practiced generally in their homelands to keep their memory and fame alive and to increase the importance of the homeland. The local patriotism that appears in the interpretations of

⁶⁷ Only in the case of 28, where Chamaeleon refers to unspecified sources, interpreters have noted that, by doing so, he dissociates himself from this interpretation; see Scorza (1934) 13; Steffen (1964) 47-8; Wehrli (1967-78) IX 80; Martano, 28 n. 1; differently Köpke (1856) 20. Giordano (1990) 152 alleges that Chamaeleon regarded Sappho and Anacreon as contemporaries. Arrighetti (1987) 143 assumes that Chamaeleon follows the tradition in his sources.

⁶⁸ Thus Marzullo (1964) 297-8; Steffen (1964) 46-7; Wehrli (1967-78) IX 79; Giordano (1990) 149-50. Huffman (2005) 26-7 makes an argument for the musician from Mytilene, “since songs by Alcman might have been part of his repertoire, while we have no other evidence that Archytas of Tarentum engaged in analysis of poetry” (27); see there, p. 5-6, for the chronology of the Pythagorean. I still think that Chamaeleon meant the Pythagorean since he characterizes him as a “harmonist,” which fits better a theoretician than a musician. If the latter were meant we would have to assume that he not only performed the songs of Alcman (which is perfectly possible), but was also an interpreter and biographer of the poet, for which we do not have evidence.

⁶⁹ See above p. 422 with n. 50.

Simonides' poems may have been one of the reasons that Chamaeleon was quite reserved as to the correctness of the explanations.

There are also some examples of the "method of Chamaeleon" where Chamaeleon does not refer to someone else as his source of information, but presents the interpretations as his own. One example is **39** where he proposes an explanation of Artemon's epithet *periphorêtos*.⁷⁰ Although his biographical interpretation is probably wrong, the method he applies is scientifically correct. He explains the adjective literally as "carried around" and not, as interpreters in antiquity and modern times mostly do, as "notorious." Hence he concludes that the effete parvenu was carried around in a litter. Obviously to reinforce his interpretation he quotes another poem of Anacreon, in which Artemon's luxurious life is being bashed.⁷¹ One feature there is that he was cruising around on a chariot typically used by women. Chamaeleon probably saw in this behavior an argument for his interpretation of the adjective. That reading does not have to be completely wrong. I would not exclude the possibility that even Anacreon was equivocating when he apostrophized Artemon as *periphorêtos*. Hence Chamaeleon's only mistake may have been that he interpreted a deliberate ambiguity too one-sidedly. If we compare this biographical interpretation of the Anacreon fragment with that of Heraclides Ponticus,⁷² it becomes obvious that Chamaeleon inferred from the verses only that Artemon lived lavishly and was carried around, while Heraclides goes far beyond what may be deduced from the text and embellishes the description of Artemon with imaginary details that have no basis in the poem. In addition, our sources do not support the assumption, found occasionally in literature,⁷³ that Chamaeleon and other authors confused the Artemon mentioned by Anacreon with the homonymous architect of the times of Pericles.

There remains the embarrassing allegation that Aeschylus was always drunk while he wrote his tragedies (**43A-B**), which Chamaeleon infers from the fact that in his *Cabiri* drunkards were on the tragic stage for the first time. He feels vindicated by an *apophthegma* of Sophocles according to which Aeschylus wrote his plays without knowing what he was doing. By combining these two pieces of information the biograph-

⁷⁰ Anacreon fr. 27 [372] Page = 8 Gentili.

⁷¹ Anacreon fr. 43 [388] Page = 82 Gentili.

⁷² Heraclides Ponticus fr. 60 Wehrli = 45 Schütrumpf.

⁷³ E.g. Giordano (1990) 175 (Chamaeleon and Heraclides), Brown (1983) (Ephorus and probably also Chamaeleon and Heraclides), Slater (1978) 186 (Ephorus).

ical “fact” is created. This interpretation is not as absurd as it may seem. Chamaeleon may have considered the words of Sophocles as authentic, so that he had to explain what it meant that Aeschylus did not compose his tragedies consciously. Since Aeschylus was regarded as the inspired poet *par excellence* and wine played an important role as a means of poetic inspiration, Chamaeleon’s conclusion seems quite obvious. It may be added that in all likelihood he only advanced a view that was widespread at his time. We find it also in a fragment of the Peripatetic Callisthenes at around the same time and in the later biographical tradition on Aeschylus.⁷⁴ It is remarkable that in **43A** we find the well-known programmatic statement “what the tragedian did himself he also had his characters do.” It seems to be caused by the fact that here there was no first-person statement of a character that could be interpreted as representing the opinion of the poet. Instead a conclusion has been drawn concerning the personality of the poet from a scene as a whole.

According to the fragments preserved, Chamaeleon himself only used poems to learn about the personality and the behavior of the poets in general (Artemon in **39**; Aeschylus in **43A-B**).⁷⁵ He did not exploit them to construct individual episodes of their lives in any fantastic way.⁷⁶ As for the way he used the method named after him in order to reconstruct the history of literature, he seems to have been quite serious: he interpreted words of the lyric “I” as evidence that Alcman was inspired by birds (**26**) and found out that Aeschylus was the first trage-

⁷⁴ Callisthenes, *FGrHist* 124 F 46; the evidence has been collected as T 117a-g in Radt’s collection.

⁷⁵ In this discussion, mention should also be made of **35**, where Chamaeleon interprets a scholium of Pindar. There the context was very probably that Chamaeleon regarded the statements of the lyric “I” as those of the poet himself. He thus had to explain Pindar’s praise of the Corinthian sacral prostitutes. So there too, the character of the poet in general seems to have been the topic; see below.

⁷⁶ The legend of the bees that built their nest in Pindar’s mouth, i.e. the story of Pindar’s “Dichterweihe” (**34A-C**), has been transmitted via various intermediary sources, so that we do not know how it was told by Chamaeleon: *Vita Pindari Ambrosiana*/Eustathius *vita Pindari* → φασιν in **34C** → Ister → Chamaeleon. Here some remarks on Ister as an intermediary source are appropriate: it is not a matter of course that whenever two or more authors are quoted for a piece of information in an ancient text the most recent one must have quoted all the older testimonies. A compiler may have created a “Zitatkette,” combining sources in which he found identical or similar data into a scheme. But in the case of the Callimachean Ister, such an assumption seems to be correct. Hence when we find in a source “X and Ister say,” it means “Ister says, referring to X.” On Ister as a compiler of preceding scholarship, see Jacoby, *FGrHist* III b I, 619-27.

dian who introduced drunkards on the tragic stage. By pointing to the above mentioned scene of the *Cabiri* he was able to prove wrong other interpreters who regarded Euripides as the inventor of this dramatic element (43A-B).

As for the second characteristic of the “method of Chamaeleon,” the use of evidence from comedy for biography and the history of literature, there is also a programmatic statement in Chamaeleon (44): “there is trustworthy information on the tragedians in comedy.” It is to be noted that in the extant fragments, comedy is primarily used to reconstruct the history of literature. When Chamaeleon claims, with reference to Aristophanes, that Aeschylus was the first choreographer among tragedians (45), that conclusion is, though wrong, the result of a plausible exegetical principle: as it seems, it was first for Aeschylus that he found this practice attested. Again in Aristophanes, Chamaeleon discovered correct information on the development that had taken place in the relation between dance and text in tragedy, and evidence that Aeschylus performed as an actor in his plays (44). He was obviously very interested in inventions (*heurêmata*) and for this sort of information comedy was, within certain limits, an appropriate source. He seems to have searched all kinds of poetry and other traditions systematically for inventors and inventions. The earliest evidence he could find showed him who was first in doing something. When he found mistakes in previous scholarship (as in 43A) he corrected them. Unlike in the case of Satyrus and other biographers, we do not have evidence that Chamaeleon also used comedy for reconstructing the character and life of historical figures.

The “method of Chamaeleon,” understood as exploiting the verses of a poet for his biography is therefore an exegetical approach of which Chamaeleon collected examples rather than practiced himself. When he did use it and when he resorted to comedy as a source, he appears to have been more careful than many of his fellow biographers.

6. Use of parallel texts in exegesis

In the preceding section, another characteristic of Chamaeleon’s working method has already become apparent. When interpreting the text of a poet he uses other texts of that poet or of other authors which support his reading, or he combines different texts in order to gain new insights. He does so when he explains the epithet *periphorêtos* (39) and when he discusses Aeschylus’ use of wine for poetic inspiration (43A-B). Also for his interpretation of the Pindar *scolium* he adduces an epigram of

Simonides as a parallel text and shows himself as well informed about Corinthian customs of his own time (35).

7. Autopsy

Chamaeleon's exegesis of the Pindar *scolium* (35) reveals another feature which makes clear that he was a serious scholar who also applied methods of historical research when writing biography. Obviously, Chamaeleon either saw the picture of the prostitutes in the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth or got his information from an eyewitness he trusted, for he declares that "it is still in existence." Theopompus also came across Simonides' epigram and describes its location as "on the left side when you enter."⁷⁷ But he refers it to the wives of the Corinthians, who had prayed to the goddess to give their husbands love for fighting. According to a passage in Plutarch which almost certainly goes back to Theopompus,⁷⁸ the Corinthians dedicated bronze statues of their wives in that temple as a reward for their help. Van Groningen is surely right in concluding that the statues, picture, and epigram were standing immediately next to one another, which brought it about that Chamaeleon and Theopompus referred the epigram to different groups of people.⁷⁹

In 37 Chamaeleon reports three conflicting solutions of the first of Simonides' riddles. The first explains the verses as an inscription on an ancient votive-offering in Chalcis. But obviously Chamaeleon has not seen it himself, which seems to be why he leaves the question unsettled whether this or one of the two other interpretations applies.

8. The biographical character of the fragments

A biographical context can be seen or is, at least, possible in all the fragments that stem from the works of the *Peri tou deina* type. I will briefly dwell on some of them where this is not at first obvious.

As stated above, Chamaeleon shows special interest in inventions, which he shares with ancient biography in general. In almost every

⁷⁷ *FGrHist* 115 F 285b.

⁷⁸ Plut. *de Herod. malign.* 39 p. 871a-b.

⁷⁹ Van Groningen (1956). It is still being debated by scholars whose interpretation was correct. Van Groningen (1956) 22 and Bravi (2006) 62-3 follow Theopompus, whereas Kurke (1996) 64-5 prefers Chamaeleon's version.

Greek literary biography a section of that kind can be found.⁸⁰ We might be tempted to consider such information part of the history of literature and not of biography, but for antiquity with its concept of consistency between *erga* and *êthos*, inventions are, as achievements, also important evidence for someone's personality. We find the topic in **26** (Alcman inspired by birds),⁸¹ in **27** (Alcman inventor of erotic songs; with reference to Archytas as source), where subsequently a conclusion is drawn regarding the personality of the poet and a concrete example is added which shows the strong connection with biographical data in a strict sense, in **41** (Thespis chooses themes outside the Dionysian myth), and in **43A-B** (Aeschylus the first to introduce drunkards into tragedy), where a discussion of his character follows which is based on the invention.

The well-known new fragment **32** that attests to two palinodes of Stesichorus, of which Chamaeleon quotes the beginnings, might be classified as purely exegetical or literary criticism. But it becomes apparent from other sources that this poem (or these poems) played an essential role in the biographical tradition on Stesichorus. His "blasphemous" account of Helen's adultery was regarded to have caused him to lose his sight, which he only regained after he had revoked the previous narrative.⁸²

⁸⁰ In the anonymous lives of tragedians which date to late antiquity but go back ultimately to Hellenistic predecessors, sections on innovations are regularly found. They are part of the more general treatment of the *technê* of the poets: Aeschylus test. 1.14-5 Radt (= *Vita Aeschyli*); cf. test. 100-10 Radt; Sophocles test. 1.4, 6, 23 Radt (= *Vita Sophoclis*); cf. test. 95-9; Euripides test. 1 I A 2 Kannicht (= *Vita Euripidis*); cf. test. 135-41. Also Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* included such a section in its first part which is today for the most part lost; see Schorn (2004) 181-196; cf. Satyrus F 3 Schorn from the *Life of Sophocles* which deals with an invention.

⁸¹ Moreover, in Chamaeleon's account Alcman appears to be a poet whose works are not the result of divine inspiration, but of his own creativity. A discussion of *enthousiasmos* vs. *technê* was contained in the first part of Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* as can be seen by two unusual quotations. We find there the verses from the *Odyssey* (14.463-7) on the negative consequences of drinking wine and the famous passage from Plato's *Phaedrus* (245a6-8) on madness (*mania*) caused by the Muses which brings poetry into being that is superior to such poetry that is only the result of poetical skill (*technê*). The quotation from the *Odyssey* is in F 6 fr. 9 Schorn, that from the *Phaedrus* in F 6 fr. 16 I; on the context of these fragments see Schorn (2001) esp. 18-21 and (2004) 192-5.

⁸² For references, see Giordano (1990) 160-1; on the probable biographical context, see most recently Kelly (2007) (with preceding literature).

In some cases, stories may derive originally from ethical contexts, which is typical for biographical writings as in **30**, where we learn that the poems of Homer as well as those of Hesiod, Archilochus, Mimnermus, and Phocylides were chanted. The topic here may have been the relation between text and music. In this case one may think of a discussion of the pedagogical function of music (n.b., that Homer, Hesiod and Phocylides were the “teachers of Greece”), which can be found also elsewhere in biography.⁸³

The text of the *scholium* by which **31B** has been transmitted is hopelessly corrupt. It is hard to gather more from it than that Chamaeleon discussed the authorship of a famous ode. It was disputed whether it was composed by Stesichorus or Lamprocles.⁸⁴ Our sources do not state from which of Chamaeleon’s works the fragment derives, but it obviously goes with *On Stesichorus*.⁸⁵ It is not necessary to think of a merely exegetical context. Giordano is right in stressing the importance of that ode in traditional Greek education, and its authorship may have been examined in an ethical discussion connected to education.⁸⁶ Alternatively, we may think of a general discussion of authorship, as is typical of biographies of poets.⁸⁷ In this case, the context would have been the *erga* of the poet, which enable the biographer to evaluate his personality.

Authorship can also have been the topic in **45** where Chamaeleon speaks of the *Skeuai* as a comedy written by either Aristophanes or Plato, although it is more likely that the decline of the art of dancing in post-Aeschylean

⁸³ Cf. Wehrli (1967-78) IX 80-1; Giordano (1990) 148-50; see Scorza (1934) 9-10 for a suggestion about the context within *De Stesichoro*; cf. also Köpke (1856) 18-9 for different views.

⁸⁴ For different interpretations, see Holwerda (1952) and Arrighetti (1987) 85-9, 215-8; cf. Martano, **31B** n. 1; it is improbable that Chamaeleon discussed the *constitutio textus*.

⁸⁵ Thus the editors.

⁸⁶ Thus Giordano (1990) 156, 158, with reference to Aristoph. *Nub.* 967.

⁸⁷ Discussions of authenticity obviously played a role in the biographies of poets. In the anonymous lives of the tragedians, information on the literary production and on spurious works can be found which presupposes discussions of that kind: Aeschylus test. 1.13 Radt; Sophocles test. 1.18 Radt; Euripides test. 1 I A 8 Kannicht. Also in other biographies, discussions of authorship appear. To name only two: Satyrus (F 1 Schorn) challenged the authenticity of the works transmitted under the name of the Cynic Diogenes and regarded Philiscus of Aegina as their author, and Sosicrates (fr. 10 Giannattasio Andria = *FGrHist* 461 T 3) athetized the diatribes of Aristippus.

tragedy was being discussed. Similar discussions of later developments can be found for example in Satyrus' *Life of Euripides*.⁸⁸

Also **38** seems to be part of an ethical discussion. It deals with the prohibition of philosophy and rhetoric in many cities and especially in Sparta "because of the ambition in your speeches, and quarrels and untimely repudiations." Unfortunately we are unable to establish what role this statement played in a book *On Stesichorus*.⁸⁹

In **35** Chamaeleon's intention is apologetic within a biographical discussion. His aim is to defend Pindar from the charge of having written on obscene, i.e. inappropriate, matter. To invalidate this possible or real allegation, he argues in two ways. He points out that it was customary among private citizens in Corinth to donate prostitutes to Aphrodite in fulfillment of vows, thus showing that the contents of the poem were in agreement with decorum there. In addition he gives an account of the role played by Corinthian prostitutes during the Persian Wars, of their participating in public cult in Corinth and of their being honored by a painting and an inscription composed by such a famous poet as Simonides. No doubt, the context is biographical. Pindar speaks here "in person" and deliberates the impact of his poem. Wilamowitz once assumed that it had been performed by Pindar himself during the ceremony.⁹⁰ Be that as it may, Chamaeleon interpreted the words of the lyrical "I" as a personal statement of the poet, as providing insight into the process of his writing of poetry – as many modern interpreters also did and do. The issue is typical of ancient biography. It is the discussion of the rapport between the poet and his audience and how it was reflected in his poetry. In this regard, it was especially conflicts which concerned interpreters. Two examples may suffice to show that tendency: the lyric poet Timotheus mentions in his *Persians* a clash in Sparta

⁸⁸ Satyrus discovers similarities in the evaluation of corrupt youths in Euripides and later comedy (F 6 fr. 39 V-VI Schorn) and records the influence of Euripides on formal aspects and dramatic elements of later comedy (F 6 fr. 39 VII 1-27 Schorn). Furthermore, he considers the moral ideas and performance of the orator Demosthenes as influenced by the poet (F 6 fr. 39 VIII Schorn). Each time these views are documented by quotations which can be quite long, so that we should not be astonished that Chamaeleon quotes verses of Plato Comicus or Aristophanes in *On Aeschylus*. They exhibit a parallel from later times to the ideal state of Aeschylus' time and point to negative developments in Chamaeleon's own time or the recent past.

⁸⁹ The explanation of Giordano (1990) 174 is unconvincing.

⁹⁰ Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922) 375; cf. Van Groningen (1960) 48-50 and Kurke (1996) 50, who hold that it was during the subsequent banquet.

where his modern type of music raised hackles. Biographical tradition made out of this statement a circumstantial story and even quoted a fake decree issued by Spartan authorities against the poet.⁹¹ In the case of Archilochus the sexual content of his poems was reported to have caused opposition among his fellow citizens. The inscription of Mnesiepes of Paros (3rd cent. BC) bears ample witness to this biographical elaboration.⁹² It does not have to concern us that in **35** Chamaeleon goes far afield in his argument and refers to historical facts and an epigram of Simonides, since that is exactly the way Satyrus proceeds in his *Life of Euripides*. The context here as well as there is ultimately ethical. The positive appraisal of the personality of the poet was defended against detractors.⁹³

In conclusion, the following can be established: in no fragment from Chamaeleon's works of the *Peri tou deina* type do we have evidence that a verse or a poem was interpreted for its own sake or that these works included definitions of words and explanations of grammar which were solely intended to facilitate the reading. All interpretations were in the Greek sense of the word biographical.

9. Fragments from works on the Homeric epics

An additional argument for considering the books *Peri tou deina* biographies is provided by the fragments of a work with a title that does not follow this scheme, I mean *Peri Iliados* in at least five books (!). In addition the existence of a work *Peri Odysseias* can be assumed with a high degree of probability. Some interpreters have regarded *Peri Iliados* and *Peri Odysseias* as parts of a more ample (unattested) work *Peri Homêrou*,⁹⁴ but I doubt that such an assumption is correct. For in view of the content of the fragments it does not seem to be incidental

⁹¹ Timotheus Pers. 206-212 Hordern; the biographical tradition based on these verses is analysed by Hordern (2002) 7-9.

⁹² Fr. E 1 col. III; for a reconstruction of the heavily damaged inscription see Clay (2001).

⁹³ In **42** interpreters usually identify a biographical context: the numerous references to pigs in Aeschylus' tragedies were interpreted by Chamaeleon as evidence for a personal predilection of their author; thus Scorza (1934) 36; Wehrli (1967-78) IX 85; cf. Giordano (1990) 178. Skeptical is Steffen (1964) 54. Such a biographical context is perfectly possible, but we do not know whether Chamaeleon presented this interpretation as his own or that of others.

⁹⁴ Thus e.g. Köpke (1856) 15; Scorza (1934) 3; Steffen (1964) 16. 43.

that *Peri Iliados* does not have the name of the poet, but that of the work in its title. What can be found there are linguistic and factual interpretations of the text of Homer: Thestor was also called Idmon because of his knowledge (23), the vocative of Πολυδάμας is Πολυδάμαν, not Πολυδάμα (18), and ἐπιμηνίσαντος is to be read instead of ἀπομηνίσαντος at T 62 (19). Also other fragments deal with linguistic and exegetical problems (17, 21, 22, 24), and one with an ethical problem, the ἐθελόκακον of Zeus (20). Context is the character of the gods in Homer, and hence the question whether Homer's descriptions are correct or not. All these fragments show that *Peri Iliados* and the hypothetical *Peri Odysseias* were typical works of a grammarian who comments on the poems of Homer, and Chamaeleon is rightly called a grammarian in that context (Χαμαιλέοντος ... τοῦ γραμματικοῦ, 21B). Such an assessment of these works is not, as one might think, contradicted by 15. Tatian, who transmits it,⁹⁵ names Chamaeleon in a long list of authors who wrote περὶ γὰρ τῆς Ὀμήρου ποιήσεως γένους τε αὐτοῦ καὶ χρόνου καθ' ὃν ἥκμασεν.⁹⁶ The names we find in that list show that Tatian summarily enumerates those who dealt in some way with the life and/or the poetry of Homer, and that it cannot be concluded that every author in that list has written on all aspects of Homeric philology and biography. I do not exclude that Chamaeleon wrote also a biographical book *On Homer* of which no fragments have survived.⁹⁷ Be that as it may, the fragments of the exegetical books show that he distinguished already in the titles between biographical and grammatical treatises.

10. The *Peri tou deina* books as biographies

The preceding sections have made clear that the fragments of Chamaeleon's *Peri tou deina* books do not contradict but rather support the assumption that they were biographies of poets in the ancient sense of the word. In the present [section I](#) will respond to more of Leo's argu-

⁹⁵ Tatianus *or. ad Graec.* 31.

⁹⁶ Chamaeleon is mentioned together with Theagenes of Rhegium, Stesimbrotus von Thasus, Antimachus of Colophon, Herodotus, Dionysius of Olynthus, Ephorus of Cyme, Philochorus of Athens, the Peripatetic Megaclides, Zenodotus, Aristophanes, Callimachus, Crates, Eratosthenes, Aristarch and Apollodorus.

⁹⁷ Köpke (1856) 15 is not right in concluding on the basis of Tatian's words that Chamaeleon wrote a biography of Homer.

ments against such a view and will conclude with a general appraisal of Chamaeleon.

Leo denies that Chamaeleon tried to reconstruct “the story of a man, his ancestry, youth and development.” Thus, Chamaeleon is not quoted by later authors for the *genos* or the basic facts of a life, but only for character traits, anecdotes and inventions. Chamaeleon’s works “contain in the form of interpretations what could be inferred from their poems about the personalities of the poets and their milieus,” and he tried to “catch the author’s personality.” This characterization is in part wrong and in part correct, but with a wrong conclusion. It is wrong that Chamaeleon does not deal with the childhood and youth of the poets. He does so in **34** (Pindar’s vocation as a poet) and in **37** (Simonides’ riddles). These fragments clearly show that he addresses the topic when signs of later developments and competences were already discernable at an earlier age, hence when knowing about these periods is useful for understanding the poet as an adult.

In addition, Leo misses analyses of the development of the personality of the poets in Chamaeleon’s works. But this is a demand that is placed on biography in modern times and not necessarily in antiquity. Ancient biographers often assumed a firm character and hence eagerly tried to find those features and competences in the childhood of their heroes that characterized them as adults. Yet Chamaeleon may even have assumed such a development in one case, namely in his *On Simonides*. In **34**, which is focused on the youth of the poet, Simonides is described in a very positive way as *sophos*,⁹⁸ whereas in **36**, which shows the poet as an old man at the court of Hiero, he is characterized as mercenary.⁹⁹ Hence

⁹⁸ On this feature of the Simonides legend, see Bell (1978); cf. Christ (1941) 52-61.

⁹⁹ This characterization, dominant in the biographical tradition concerning Simonides, can be found e.g. in Aristophanes (*Pax* 607-9), Xenophanes (VS 21 B 21), Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3.2,1405b23-28) and Theophrastus (fr. 516 FHS&G); for a discussion of the evidence see Christ (1941) 61-7 and Bell (1978). Obviously, Chamaeleon has adjusted these two anecdotes that do not seem to have been hostile to Simonides originally, to that argument. In principle, the parody on Homer is nothing but a typical example of impromptu poetry as it was practiced at symposia. The second anecdote shows Simonides as an extremely positive figure, if we ignore the introductory words of Chamaeleon. By his action he contributes to the fame of his patron, shows his own *κοσμιότης* and challenges the allegation of being greedy, as has been pointed out by Christ (1941) 68. Chamaeleon seems to reject this portrayal and therefore gives a new interpretation to these anecdotes. The fact that we find reinterpretations of originally pro-Simonidean anecdotes makes clear that Chamaeleon did not invent the anecdotes himself but found them in the tradition.

Chamaeleon may have assumed a change of personality and regarded this as taking place when the poet was an old man. If this assumption is correct, Chamaeleon was in agreement with Aristophanes and part of the later biographical tradition.¹⁰⁰

That the fragments do not transmit information on the family, birth, and death of the poets has been rightly observed by Leo, but is, in my opinion, accidental. Most fragments are transmitted by Athenaeus, and this author is not interested at all in such data. The case of the three great tragedians is instructive. Numerous authors provide us with information on these topics and with many variants. But when we check the sources of those *testimonia* in the volumes of *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, we realize that Athenaeus is completely missing.¹⁰¹ It is therefore not strange at all that these kinds of testimonies are (still) missing among the fragments of Chamaeleon.

As shown above, not all biographical and literary historical information on the poets is based on their works, as Leo thinks.

The other features which Leo lists (anecdotes, interest in inventions, character traits, long quotations and interpretations of poetry) are indeed characteristic of the works of Chamaeleon. Yet they are not, as Leo thinks, arguments *against*, but *for* assuming that they were biographies. That they are typical of the lives of poets only became clear with the publication of Satyrus' *Life of Euripides*, i.e. after Leo had published his contributions on Chamaeleon.¹⁰²

Furthermore, Leo is surely right in stressing the differences between the works of Chamaeleon and the *Bioi* of Aristoxenus. But what he does not take into account is that they arise from the fact that Aristoxenus wrote lives of people for whom the sources were completely different: Pythagoras, Archytas, Socrates, Plato and Telestes. Only Telestes was a poet, but the single anecdote that is preserved from this biog-

¹⁰⁰ On this feature of the Simonides legend, see Bell (1978) e.g. 38. W. W. Fortenbaugh reminds me that this change from youth to old age fits Peripatetic doctrine; cf. Fortenbaugh (2007) 59.

¹⁰¹ The death of Euripides is referred to in 13.598d-2, but only accidentally in a discussion of love affairs of famous men. It is mentioned in a poem of Hermesianax quoted by Athenaeus in that context (fr. 7.61-8 Powell = Eur. test. 106a Kannicht).

¹⁰² Also the inscription of Mnesiepes was found after Leo had published his contributions. This account is not named *Bios* in the inscription, but contains a (partial?) biography of Archilochus and is characterized by features similar to those of Satyrus' *Life of Euripides*.

raphy does not enable us to compare it with those in Chamaeleon's works.¹⁰³ It was probably rather different from them since Aristoxenus knew Telestes in person and was not forced to extract biographical data from his poetry. Also his other biographies dealt with men of the recent past. Several fragments show that he interviewed contemporary witnesses or explored local traditions. To Chamaeleon only the latter were occasionally available. On the lives of most of the poets whom he studied no or almost no authentic biographical traditions are likely to have been available in the 4th century BC¹⁰⁴ Hence Chamaeleon had to resort to legends circulating, biographical information in the works of others, and to "biographical passages" in the poems when he wanted to reconstruct their lives and personalities. He was especially aware that information on single events in the lives of the poets that he found in his sources was often of questionable value. He nevertheless seems to have considered it his duty to collect and report such traditions, but not to accept them without criticism. It is, I think, excusable that he generally regarded statements of the lyrical "I" which referred to poetry itself as autobiographical. Who can say for sure that they cannot reflect, at least sometimes, the personal opinion of the poet? And has it not been only a short time since modern interpreters became cautious against the autobiographical value of such statements?

It is remarkable that in two instances Chamaeleon actually explains his hermeneutical principles, once discussing the role of poems for the knowledge of poets (43A) and another time regarding the value of comedy as a biographical source (44). In doing so, he reveals the foundations of his exegesis and provides the opportunity to accept or refuse them. By quoting as a matter of principle those texts on which he himself and other interpreters rely for information, he makes it possible to check the correctness of these interpretations. I am inclined to see that as characteristic of scientific work.

What were Chamaeleon's works of the *Peri tou deina* type? In my opinion they were collections of existing biographical interpretations of poetry and of other biographical evidence, supplemented by the results of Chamaeleon's own research. I think they were typical Peripatetic collections, in this case, collections of biographical information on the

¹⁰³ Fr. 117 Wehrli.

¹⁰⁴ An exception may have been Aeschylus, about whose life authors like Ion of Chios may have transmitted authentic information.

poets of the past. They will have included everything available in this regard, or at least everything relevant, and Chamaeleon will have tried to reconstruct the general outline of their lives and, as exactly as possible, their personalities. The focus on ethics that can be discerned in some fragments suggests that collecting material was not Chamaeleon's ultimate goal. As in the case of Peripatetic biography in general, also in Chamaeleon's works moral instruction seems to have been intended. Both their form, as far as it can be seen from the fragments, and their contents make it very probable that they were, like the works of other authors entitled *Peri tou deina*, biographies in the ancient Greek sense. Considering the extreme rareness of *Bioi* of poets,¹⁰⁵ we have to conclude that biographies of poets were usually given the title *Peri tou deina*.

Works cited

- Arrighetti, G. 1987. *Poeti, eruditi e biografì. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura* (Pisa: Giardini).
- . 1994.: "Riflessione sulla letteratura e biografia presso i Greci," in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, ed. F. Montanari (Vandœuvres - Genève: Fondation Hardt), 211-262.
- Bagordo, A. 1998. *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama. Mit einer Sammlung der Fragmente* (Stuttgart - Leipzig: Teubner).
- Bartol, K. 1998: "Schnee beim Gelage: zu Simonides, Eleg. 25 W²," *Eos* 85: 185-188.
- Bell, J. M. 1978. "Κίμβλιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 28: 29-86.
- Boas, M. 1905. *De epigrammatis Simonideis. Pars prior: Commentatio critica de epigrammatum traditione* (Diss. Amstelodami, printed Groningae: Wolters).
- Bollansée, J. 1999. *Hermippos of Smyrna and His Biographical Writings. A Reappraisal* (Leuven: Peeters).
- Bravi, L. 2006. *Gli epigrammi di Simonide e le vie della tradizione* (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo).
- Brown, C. 1983. "From Rags to Riches: Anacreons's Artemon," *Phoenix* 37: 1-15.

¹⁰⁵ See above.

- Brussich, G.F. 2000. *Laso di Ermione. Testimonianze e frammenti. Testo, traduzione e commento* (Pisa: ETS).
- Calame, C. 1983. *Alcman. Fragmenta edidit, veterum testimonia collegit C. C.* (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo).
- Camassa, G. 1994. "La biografia," in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica. Vol. I. La produzione e la circolazione del testo. Tomo III. I Greci e Roma* (Roma: Salerno): 303-332.
- Christ, G. 1941. *Simonidesstudien* (Diss. Zürich, printed Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusdruckerei).
- Clay, D. 2001. "The Scandal of Dionysos on Paros (The Mnesiepes Inscription E1 III)," *Prometheus* 27: 97-112.
- . 2004. *Archilochos Heros. The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis* (Cambridge, Mass. - London: Harvard University Press).
- Davies, M. 1991. *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum fragmenta. Post D. L. Page edidit M.D.* (Oxford: University Press).
- Dorandi, T. 1999. *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments, texte établi et traduit par T. D.* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 2007. "Biography and the Aristotelian Peripatos," in *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit. Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 26.-29. Juli 2006 in Würzburg*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin etc.: De Gruyter), 45-78.
- Giordano, D. 1990². *Chamaeleontis Heracleotae fragmenta iteratis curis commentarioque instruxit D. G.* (Bologna: Pàtron).
- Groningen, B. A. van 1956. "Théopompe ou Chamaeléon? À propos de Simonide 137 B, 104 D," *Mnemosyne* IV 9: 11-22.
- . 1960. *Pindare au banquet. Les fragments des scolies édités avec un commentaire critique et explicatif* (Leyde: Sythoff).
- Harding, Ph. 2006: *Didymos: On Demosthenes. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary by Ph. H.* (Oxford: University Press).
- Holwerda, D. 1952: "De novo Chamaeleontis studiorum testimonio," *Mnemosyne* IV 5: 228-231.
- Hordern, J. H. 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: University Press).
- Huffman, C. A. 2005. *Archytas of Tarentum. Pythagorean, Philosopher and Mathematician King* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Kelly, A. 2007. "Stesikhoros and Helen," *Museum Helveticum* 64: 1-21.
- Kurke, L. 1996. "Pindar and the Prostitutes, or Reading Ancient 'Pornography'," *Arion* 4: 49-75.

- Köpke, E. 1856. *De Chamaeleontis Heracleotae vita librorumque reliquiis* (Progr. Berlin: Hertz).
- Lamedica, A. 1985. "Il P.Oxy. 1800 e le forme della biografia greca," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* III 3: 55-75.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore: Hopkins University Press).
- Leo, F. 1901. *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- . 1904. "Didymos Περὶ Δημοσθένους," *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*: 254-261. Repr. in *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, ed. E. Fraenkel (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura) 1960: 387-394.
- . 1912. "Satyros βίος Εὐριπίδου," *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*: 273-290. Repr. in *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, ed. E. Fraenkel (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura) 1960: 365-383.
- Lesky, A. 1972. *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1990. "Problems of Early Greek Tragedy. Pratinas and Phrynichus," in *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir H. Ll.-J.* (Oxford: University Press), 225-237 [first published in 1966].
- Marzullo, B. 1964. "Alcman fr. 59 P.," *Helikon* 4: 297-302.
- Molyneux, J. H. 1992. *Simonides. A Historical Study* (Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci).
- Momigliano, A. 1993. *The Development of Greek Biography. Expanded Edition* (Cambridge, Mass. - London: Harvard University Press 1993. In this volume: "Second Thoughts on Greek Biography," 105-121; first published in *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afdeling Letterkunde* N. R. 34,7, 1971: 245-257.
- Page, D. L. 1981: *Further Greek Epigrams*. Edited by D.L.P. Revised and Prepared for Publication by R.D. Dawe and J. Diggle (Cambridge: University Press).
- Pelling, C. (2000): "Fun with Fragments. Athenaeus and the Historians," in *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, ed. D. Braund and J. Wilkins (Exeter: University of Exeter Press), 171-190, 556-557.

- Pfeiffer, R. ²1978. *Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* (München: Beck).
- Privitera, G. A. 1965. *Laso di Ermione nella cultura ateniese e nella tradizione storiografica* (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo).
- Rudberg, G. 1947. "Thespis und die Tragödie," *Eranos* 45: 13-21.
- Schmitz, H. 1970. *Hypsos und Bios. Stilistische Untersuchungen zum Alltagsrealismus in der archaischen griechischen Chorlyrik* (Bern: Lang).
- Schorn, S. 2001. "Platons Inspirationstheorie in Satyros' Euripidesvita (Satyrus, Vita Euripidis, POxy. IX 1176, Fr. 16 = Plat. Phaedr. 245A6-8)," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 134: 15-21.
- . 2004. *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 2007. "'Periegetische Biographie', 'Historische Biographie': Neanthes von Kyzikos (FgrHist 84) als Biograph," in *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit. Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 26.-29. Juli 2006 in Würzburg*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin etc.: De Gruyter), 115-156.
- . 2008. "Chamaeleon-Studien," in *Dona sunt pulcherrima. Festschrift für Rudolf Rieks*, ed. K. Herrmann, K. Geus, U. Fehn, E. Porsch (Oberhaid: Utopica), 50-80.
- Schweighaeuser, J. 1801-7. *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, vol. 1-9, (Argentorati: Typographia Societatis Bipontinae).
- Scorza, G. 1934. "Il peripatetico Cameleonte," *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* 18: 1-48.
- Slater, W. J. 1978. "Artemon and Anacreon: No Text without Context," *Phoenix* 32: 185-194.
- Sonnabend, H. 2002. *Geschichte der antiken Biographie. Von Isokrates bis zur Historia Augusta* (Stuttgart - Weimar: Metzler).
- Steffen, V. 1964. *Chamaeleontis fragmenta* (Varsoviae: Panstwowe Wyd. Naukowe).
- Stuart, D. R.: *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Theodoridis, C. 1972. "Drei übersehene Bruchstücke des Apollodoros von Athen," *Glotta* 50: 29-34.
- Wehrli, F. 1967-1978¹⁻². *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar* (Basel: Schwabe) [1. *Dikaiarchos*, 1967²; 2. *Aristoxenos*, ²1967; 3. *Klearchos*, 1969²; 4. *Demetrios von Phaleron*, 1968²; 5. *Straton von Lampsakos*, 1969²; 6. *Lykon und Ariston von Keos*, 1968²; 7.

444 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

- Herakleides Pontikos*, 1969²; 8. *Eudemos von Rhodos*, 1969²; 9. *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes*, 1969²; 10. *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler. Rückblick: Der Peripatos in vorchristlicher Zeit. Register*, 1969²; Supplementband 1. *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*, 1974; Supplementband 2. *Sotion*, 1978.].
- . 1968. “Chamaileon 1,” in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*. Suppl. 11: 368-372.
- West, S. 1970. “Chalcenteric Negligence,” *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 20: 288-296.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. 1922. *Pindaros* (Berlin: Weidmann).

Aspects of the Epigraphical and Papyrological Tradition of Praxiphanes

Tiziano Dorandi

Papyri and inscriptions have contributed concretely to the knowledge of the life, the writings and the thought of the Peripatetic philosopher Praxiphanes. We find one inscription (fr. 4) and four papyrus texts (fr. 7, 12, 15, 20) in Wehrli's ninth fascicle of the *Schule des Aristoteles* devoted to Praxiphanes (along with Phantias and Chamaeleon). Besides the two occurrences of Praxiphanes' name in two papyri published after Wehrli's collection, we find only one new papyrus and four epigraphic documents attributed to our philosopher in Matelli's edition. All of these texts have been recently edited, and have been subjected to thorough investigations which have improved our understanding of their content.

In my paper I propose to examine four texts.¹ I have divided my contribution into five sections: (1) a Delian inscription honoring Praxiphanes (**14**), (2) the Epicurean Carneiscus and Praxiphanes on friendship (**20a-c**), (3) Philodemus on Praxiphanes' *Περὶ ποιημάτων*

¹ I have not taken into consideration the four papyrus fragments reedited in the *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici* (86 1-4T) by Lundon (1999) and by Manetti and Montanari (1999). They correspond to **3A**, **10**, **25** and **26** of Matelli's edition. I have also excluded the four epigraphic testimonies added by Matelli (fr. ***15**, ***16** and ***17**).

(27), (4) *PHamb.* 128 (*33a-c): remains of a writing on poetic diction of Praxiphanes?, and (5) a conclusion.

1. Honors to Praxiphanes in an inscription from Delos

In an inscription from Delos (*IG* XI 4. 613: fr. 4 = **14**), published in 1904 by Dürrbach² and recently revisited by Haake,³ a Praxiphanes, son of Dionysiphanes, is honored as *euergetes* and *proxenos* by the Delians, who grant to him at the request of Choerylus, son of Tharsynon, *ateleia pantôn, enktesis, politeia*, and the *proedria* in the *agones* ἐπειδὴ Πραξιφάνης *vacat* | Διονυσιφάνους χρήσιμος ὢν | διατελεῖ τῇ πόλει τῇ Δηλίων | καὶ ποιεῖ ὅ τι δύναται ἀγαθὸν | Δηλίου καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ (lines 4-8). The decree is dated in the years between 270 and 260 in consideration of the fact that the proponent of the honors, Choerylus son of Tharsynon, is known from another inscription dated to the same time (*IG* IX 4. 614, 2).⁴

The identification of Praxiphanes – named without mentioning his origin and without specifying his interests in philosophy – with the homonymous Peripatetic was proposed by Wilhelm⁵ and by Crönert,⁶ and it has not been questioned except by Salvadori Baldascino, and then with weak arguments.⁷ The hypothesis that it refers to the philosopher is supported in particular by onomastic reasons, such as the extreme rarity of the names Praxiphanes and Dionysiphanes. The name of Praxiphanes' father, Dionysiphanes (Διονυσιφάνης),⁸ was already known thanks to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria,⁹ who cites it with the orthography Διονυσοφάνης.¹⁰

The identity of the Praxiphanes in the Delian inscription and of the homonymous Peripatetic philosopher¹¹ allows us to clarify his chronology and

² Dürrbach (1904) 137 Nr. 33.

³ Haake (2007) 247-51.

⁴ Haake (2007) 247-8 n. 4.

⁵ Wilhelm (1905) 3-4.

⁶ Crönert (1906) 74 n. 355^a.

⁷ Salvadori Baldascino (1990), whose conclusions I accepted in Dorandi (1999) 36. But see *infra* n. 10.

⁸ Haake (2007) 249 n. 13.

⁹ Clem. Alex. *strom.* 1.16.79.3 (fr. 10 = **9A**).

¹⁰ Salvadori Baldascino chiefly based his refutation of the identification of the two people on this orthographic variant. Haake (2007) 249 n. 12 has however demonstrated the inconsistency of this objection.

¹¹ Haake (2007) 249-51.

also helps, together with the *Philistas* of Carneiscus, to define the relations between Praxiphanes and Epicurus which are discussed in a controversial passage of the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*.¹²

2. The Epicurean Carneiscus and Praxiphanes on Friendship

We would only have known the name of Carneiscus, an Epicurean of the first generation, if the remains of the second book of his writings, entitled *Philistas*, had not been discovered in a fragmentary, carbonized scroll in the library of Philodemus at Herculaneum (*PHerc.* 1027).¹³ For his collection (fr. 7 = **20a-20e**), Wehrli was able to use the old, provisional edition of *Philistas* procured by Crönert.¹⁴ Carneiscus' book was edited again by Capasso, together with an Italian translation, an introduction, and commentary.¹⁵

Carneiscus' name appears in a letter of Epicurus preserved in Philodemus' *Pragmateiai*.¹⁶ He was most likely a native of Asia Minor, perhaps of Cos or Rhodes. He wrote a work in at least two books (maybe three) called Φιλίστας and dedicated to an unknown Zopyrus (col. 16.2), where he expounded the Epicurean conception of friendship.¹⁷ The final part of the second book, the only extant part of this work, is directed against Praxiphanes. Carneiscus criticizes a *suggramma* on friendship by Praxiphanes because the Peripatetic philosopher, basing himself on erroneous opinions, proposed a model of inadequate behavior in the relations with friends, and very different from that of Philistas.

The Φιλίστας of Carneiscus is a work that fits into the philosophical tradition of the *laudes amicorum*, a literary genre very popular with the members of the Garden, as the titles of many books by Epicurus and by the Epicureans of successive generations attest.

Capasso¹⁸ had reasserted and supported De Witt's hypothesis,¹⁹ that these "commemorative" writings had the purpose "of emphasizing

¹² See *infra*.

¹³ Capasso (1988) 29-82 and Dorandi (1993).

¹⁴ Crönert (1906) 69-74, 179-80.

¹⁵ Capasso (1988).

¹⁶ Phld. *Pragm.* (*PHerc.* 1418), col. 19.1-5 Militello.

¹⁷ On the person and the life of Philistas and Zopyrus, see Capasso (1988) 53-6.

¹⁸ Capasso (1988) 37-53, from which the citations are taken.

¹⁹ De Witt (1954) 31-5, 118-20, 252-352.

within the Epicurean centers the historical and spiritual heritage of the school and of transmitting it to future generations” (42). Capasso completes the picture “of the reflection and the inquiry of the Epicureans into their past” (46), by citing other texts from the literary production of the Garden that concern the events of its own history, in which “the praise of an Epicurean, who always seems to be a person no longer living, is accomplished through the documented representation of his daily conduct or the narration of the events of his life, often implicitly or explicitly contrasted with the *diaita* of the people not affiliated with the school” (49). The Φιλίστας may fall within that genre of literature of “great educational value,” that “constituted a sort of exemplary ‘autobiography’ of the Garden” (49) even though Carneiscus’ work concerns not only the death of Philistas, “but his entire life, because it shows as apparent the exemplary way, in which ‘from adolescence... to death’ (XVI 10-14) he fulfilled the Epicurean philosophy, above all... the relationship with friends” (52).

The fact that Carneiscus, an Epicurean of the first generation, had argued with Praxiphanes should be considered in relation to the testimony of Apollodorus of Athens, according to whom Epicurus had Nausiphanes and Praxiphanes as teachers.²⁰ This information is in conflict with the chronology of the two philosophers, Praxiphanes being younger than or contemporary with Epicurus. This was consequently thought to be an error of Diogenes or of Apollodorus. Jacoby’s proposal to suppress the name of Praxiphanes has had wide success.²¹ Only recently, Laks has sought to defend the transmitted text.²² He argues that although chronology prevents us from supposing that Epicurus was a student of Praxiphanes, the writing of Carneiscus proves that a relationship between Praxiphanes and the school of Epicurus existed, which suggests a “construction doxographique” (67), that making Epicurus a student of descendents both of Democritus (Nausiphanes) and of Aristotle (Praxiphanes) would have had the intention of presenting him as their follower and “de rapporter la philosophie aux doctrines majeurs dont on la fait dépendre” (67-8). Capasso admits therefore that the chronological proximity and some doctrinal contacts between the two philosophers “may have given the opponents of Epicurus, or

²⁰ Apollod. *FGrHist* 244 F 41 cited by Diog. Laert. 10.13 (fr. 5 = 6). A useful summary of the debate in Capasso (1984) 392-407 and Id. (1988) 56-8.

²¹ Jacoby (1902) 354-5 n. 3. Cf. Crönert (1906) 21 and 175.

²² Laks (1976) 66-8.

a tradition unfavorable to him, an occasion to fabricate the note that the founder of the Garden – who, as is well known, boasted of being self-taught – had been an apprentice of Praxiphanes.” Capasso sees in Carneiscus’ *Philistas* the “expression of a special atmosphere between the school of Praxiphanes and that of Epicurus” (58).²³ None of the proposed solutions appears cogent, and I see no other solution than to suppress (with Jacoby) the name of Praxiphanes or, even better, to obelize the passage which, in my opinion, is irreparably corrupted.

Let me to come now to the content of *Philistas* and the polemic of Carneiscus with Praxiphanes. Despite the truly meager amount of preserved text, often reduced to disjointed sentences and without an immediate context, we can get an overview that is in some respects satisfactory.²⁴

Apart from the occasional reason that induced Carneiscus to discuss some of Praxiphanes’ theses on friendship, Capasso underscores two other points:²⁵ 1. Carneiscus contrasts the conduct that his adversary theorizes and recommends in his writing, and, apparently, puts into practice, with the conduct already realized in the daily life of Philistas. 2. The argument between Carneiscus and Praxiphanes must be framed within the conflict that divided the Peripatetic and Epicurean schools on ethical grounds.

In the part of *Philistas* which has been preserved, the praise of the protagonist alternates continuously with the polemic against the Peripatetic adversary. Carneiscus says in praise of Philistas that “from adolescence... to death” he was “beautifully ornamented with such reasoning,” that he never adopted any vice, that he remembered always “the end which nature has given to man,” and that he omitted “nothing of the best life,” nor did he acquire the “things that are held in high regard by most people” (col. 16.9-17.7).²⁶ Philistas also knew how to behave well “on the occasion of the death of friends, and he neither did anything hostile or rude according to such rules, nor did he recklessly bring trouble upon himself” (col. 21.8-14).

²³ Capasso (1988) 56-8.

²⁴ Capasso (1988) 56-82. In the pages that follow I summarize his results in broad strokes, leaving to others, eventually, the task of deepening or reformulating certain aspects, such as the reconstruction of Praxiphanes’ doctrine on friendship and his connections with Aristotle and Theophrastus.

²⁵ Capasso (1988) 58-9.

²⁶ I have used Capasso’s translation.

Conversely, the Epicurean directed at Praxiphanes at least five accusations: 1. In his work discussing friendship, Praxiphanes based himself on false assumptions (col. 16.1-8) and on misconceptions (col. 21.1-3); 2. “Praxiphanes was very far from having derived by reasoning, any of the essentials concerning friendship (περὶ φιλίας), or from assuming the proper attitude on the occasion of the death of friends,” and “the discourse that he gave concerning these things was laden with great discrepancies...” (col. 15.1-12); 3. The σύγγραμμα of Praxiphanes is an example of petty behavior during the entire course of his life and of his poor habits with friends (col. 21.3-7); 4. Those who like Praxiphanes are “far from saying about friendship or the rest, how many things, among the necessary (things), lead to a blessed life“ are all deceivers (col. 16.1-9); 5. Those, then, who follow them will live unhappily and with no defense against fears and desires (col. 19.2-11).

The polemic therefore had as its object the συναναστροφὴ φίλοις, the “poor habits with friends” (col. 21.5-6) and the κατάστασις ἐν φίλοις τελευταῖς “the proper attitude on the occasion of the death of friends” (col. 15.8-9).

The position of the Peripatetic philosopher remains to be determined.²⁷ Capasso is convinced that Praxiphanes “carried on the ideas of Aristotle and of his own teacher Theophrastus” (59). In an extensive examination of the positions of the two Peripatetic philosophers on friendship, in close comparison with the Epicurean theses, the scholar strives to reconstruct the doctrinal background of the conflict between Praxiphanes and Carneiscus. Regarding the accusation of having bad relationships with friends, we cannot rule out, according to Capasso, the social and economic gap between Praxiphanes and Carneiscus, the latter being “so poor as to induce Epicurus...²⁸ to intervene personally in his favor because a true exponent, along with Philistas whom he exalted, of the doctrine of the *lathe biôsas*” (71). To clarify the other accusation, that is, of not observing a proper attitude (κατάστασις) on the occasion of the death of a friend,²⁹ Capasso begins by reconstructing the three fundamental moments of the κατάστασις of the Epicurean sage:³⁰ “1. Being aware that the event does not in any way affect his

²⁷ Capasso (1988) 59-71.

²⁸ In the letter cited *above* (n. 16).

²⁹ See col. 2.1-18, 6.2-5, 15.1-9, 18.7-12, 21.1-6.

³⁰ Capasso (1988) 71-82.

companion's fate in the sense that it does not scrape his already perfect condition of happiness; 2. Avoiding the attempt to remove the natural sadness for his loss; 2. Seeking to overcome that affliction and to move on by finding pleasure in the fruitful remembrance of his character" (77). In light of these considerations, the scholar maintains that in the interpretation of Carneiscus, while Philistas conducted himself well (καλῶς ἀνεστρέφετο) on the occasion of the death of a friend, Praxiphanes failed to indicate the suitable attitude (τὴν προσήκουσαν κατάστασιν). The incompleteness of the passage prevents us from understanding the motives for Carneiscus' criticism, but "it is possible to suppose with a certain probability" (77), beginning again from a comparison with the Aristotelian and Theophrastean positions, that "the disagreement probably occurred over the first and third moments of the κατάστασις" (78). The disagreement between Carneiscus and Praxiphanes over the κατάστασις ἐν φίλοις τελευταῖς - concludes Capasso - found "its assumptions in the interpretations furnished by their two schools of the more general themes of life, friendship, and death. The *suggramma* of the Peripatetic and the polemical response in his *Philistas* may ultimately be considered a moment of Hellenistic speculation about friendship and death" (81).

3. Philodemus on Praxiphanes' Περὶ ποιημάτων

After having criticized in the first surviving columns of Book V of the Περὶ ποιημάτων (*PHerc.* 1425, col. 1-12. 9 Mangoni) the doctrines of Heraclides of Pontus in his Περὶ ποιητικῆς καὶ ποιητῶν, Philodemus examines the theses of two critics of whom he has knowledge through a certain Philomelus (col. 12. 10-12):³¹ Praxiphanes and Demetrius of Byzantium. The section dedicated to Praxiphanes is very limited, but nonetheless of great interest (12.10-34: fr. 12 = **27**).

We read in Philodemus:³²

"As for those cited by Philomelus, those who consider an excellent poet (ποιητῆς ἄριστος) to be he who remains at about the same level in stories, in other representations of characters, and in style, perhaps say something true, but they do not define a good poet (ποιητῆς ἀγαθός); one in fact could determine this like the virtue of a writer of mimes, a

³¹ The identity of Philomelus and the extent of his influence on Philodemus remain debated problems. See, for a concise discussion, Mangoni (1993) 48-9.

³² I have used Mangoni's translation (1993) 170.

teller of tales, or, say, any writer of prose. Likewise, the assertion that the style (λέξις) and the facts (πράγματα) are similarly necessary is reasonable. Praxiphanes asserts other things in regard to (poetic) virtue in the first book of *On Poems* (Περὶ ποιημάτων), if sometimes, the facts also being represented...”

The meaning of the first part of the passage does not pose problems. Philodemus reports and criticizes the definitions of a “excellent poet” which he read in Philomelus. The opinion of those who consider a excellent poet to be he who can keep to the same level in dealing with μύθοι, ἡθοποιΐαι and λέξις; it does not succeed in defining the “good poet” (lines 12-20). In these three aspects, it clearly reflects the distinction made by Aristotle among the six μέρη of tragedy (μῦθος ἡθῆ, λέξις, διάνοια, ὄψις, μελοποιΐα),³³ from which is also taken the terminology with the slight variation of ἡθοποιΐα for ἡθος. The fact that διάνοια, ὄψις, and μελοποιΐα are omitted in Philodemus is convincingly explained by Mangoni, who supposes that we are faced with “an adaptation of Aristotelian theory in order to be able to apply it to poetry as a whole (and not only to tragedy)” (216).

In the following lines (lines 20-24) the adversaries seek once again³⁴ to propose as essential some overly generic requirements which are common to both poets and writers of prose, the latter being exemplified by the μιμογράφοι and the ἀρεταλόγοι.³⁵

The interpretation of the following sentence is more complicated: “Likewise, the assertion that the style and the facts are similarly necessary is reasonable.” Jensen’s hypothesis that this formulation is different or, in any case, distinct from the preceding definition of the “good poet”³⁶ was criticized by Rostagni,³⁷ who argues that it is “merely a more general and comprehensive expression of the first” (407) which Philodemus used to summarize the Peripatetic doctrine in the “fundamental concept that considers the attention to both content and style as indispensable conditions for good poems” (406). Praxiphanes and Demetrius of Byzantium would have given nothing but “variations of the same concept” (406). This interpretation was, in turn, rejected by

³³ Arist. *Po.* 1449b 31-1450a10.

³⁴ Cf. col. 7.13-20.

³⁵ Cf. Mangoni (1993) 216-7.

³⁶ Jensen (1923/1973) 96.

³⁷ Rostagni (1923/1955) 404-16.

Zucker³⁸ for grammatical reasons. Magnoni's exegesis appears more convincing, according to which Philodemus introduces here "a new statement on his adversaries; there is however no need to postulate different authors" (218). Mangoni also conveniently notes how the distinction between πράγματα and λέξις recalls the application that Aristotle makes in the fields of poetry (*Po.* 1454a14 and 1456a34) and rhetoric (*Rhet.* 1-2: on πράγματα; 3: on λέξις).

Finally, we come to Praxiphanes, whose proposition is unfortunately preserved in such a poor condition that it seriously impedes comprehension.

This is the text proposed by Mangoni: Πρα[ξ]ιφάνης δ' ἕτερα μὲν | [τ]ίνα λέγει περὶ τῆς ἀρητῆς ἐν [τ]ῷ πρώτῳ περὶ | ποιη[μά]των, εἰ δ' ἐνίοτε | καὶ π[ραγ]μάτων ὄντων | [...]. . . . The scholar rightly renounces the reconstruction proposed by Jensen, correcting letters which he saw on the papyrus and on the drawings: [ἦν] ἐνίοτε | καὶ π[ραγ]μάτων ὄντων | [ἀγα]θ[ῶν] οὐκ ἐνεῖναι | [φησιν] (scil. τὴν ἀρητήν). (Praxiphanes) "maintains that although there are sometimes good contents, it (poetic virtue) does not exist," but she does not exclude the general interpretation: "Praxiphanes would have asserted that excellence of the πράγματα is not enough to make good poetry, showing that he attributed a decisive importance to the λέξις" (219).³⁹

Before discussing the interpretation of Philodemus' testimony as a whole, it is necessary to linger over the title of Praxiphanes' work. Philodemus attests that the title is *On Poems*, Περὶ ποιημάτων. Diogenes Laertius records that Praxiphanes had transcribed a dialogue about poets (Περὶ ποιητῶν) between Plato and Isocrates: ὁ δ' οὖν φιλόσοφος (sc. Πλάτων) καὶ Ἰσοκράτει φίλος ἦν. καὶ αὐτῶν Πραξιφάνης ἀνέγραψε διατριβὴν τίνα περὶ ποιητῶν γενομένην ἐν ἀγρῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι ἐπιξευωθέντος τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους.⁴⁰ Diogenes Laertius' testimony does not allow us to conclude that Praxiphanes' work had *On Poets* (Περὶ ποιητῶν) as its title, but only that he related the discussion between Isocrates and Plato about poets. Whatever the title was, the existence of this work by Praxiphanes is not to be doubted. Scholars have therefore wondered if there

³⁸ Zucker (1927) 244-5.

³⁹ See also Capasso's discussion (1984) 407-15.

⁴⁰ Diog. Laert. 3.8 (22), "Now Plato was a friend of Isocrates. And Praxiphanes makes them converse about poets at a country-seat where Plato was entertaining Isocrates" (Hicks' translation).

was a connection between the two works. Wilamowitz seems inclined to identify them; Rostagni is certain of the connection and of the title *Περὶ ποιητῶν*.⁴¹ Conversely, both Brink⁴² and Wehrli⁴³ flatly deny such a relationship. Brink refers to the parallel case of Aristotle as the author of a dialogue *Περὶ ποιητῶν* and a treatise *Περὶ ποιητικῆς*; Wehrli argues that Praxiphanes had wanted in the dialogue *Περὶ ποιητῶν* to justify the pedagogical function of poetry against Plato's condemnation, while he had reserved the treatise *Περὶ ποιημάτων* to discuss general questions of literary history and of poetry.⁴⁴

In spite of the brevity of Philodemus' passage, the uncertainties in the reconstruction of his text, and what I just observed regarding Diogenes' testimony, we may attempt to list some acquisitions, which may be summarized as follows:⁴⁵ 1. Praxiphanes wrote a *Περὶ ποιημάτων* in at least two books; 2. Philodemus mentions the first book in a discussion of the doctrines of the Peripatetics and the Stoics concerning the good poet and good poems; 3. Philodemus' source is an unknown Philomelus; 4. The passage in which Philodemus discusses Praxiphanes is unfortunately only partially preserved. One still gets the impression (as Rostagni does) that Philodemus mentions the theses of Praxiphanes and Demetrius of Byzantium as variants of the Aristotelian concept, that attention to both content and form are indispensable conditions of good poems. Praxiphanes would have reinforced the role of form, most likely by referring (Jensen) to the discussion of the forms and the limits of the *virtutes dicendi* of Theophrastus' *Περὶ λέξεως*; 5. Philodemus does not fully share Praxiphanes' position, and he reaffirms the unity of thought and form; 6. It is not necessary to admit the unity of Praxiphanes' two aesthetic writings.

4. *PHamb.* 128: the remains of a writing on poetic diction of Praxiphanes?

Bruno Snell published the remains of a papyrus of the Hamburg Collection, datable on paleographic grounds to the 3rd century BCE, which preserves parts of three columns of a text that is closely related to

⁴¹ Wilamowitz (1920²) 2.106-7. Rostagni (1926-7/1955) 288 n. 1.

⁴² Brink (1946) 23 n. 2.

⁴³ Wehrli (1969) 109.

⁴⁴ Further details in Capasso (1984) 411-2. See also Janko (1991) 58.

⁴⁵ Capasso (1984) 412-4.

what Aristotle says in *Poetics* 20-1.⁴⁶ The first column is too fragmentary to yield anything concrete. It says (lines 6-12) that a word with its first syllable removed becomes meaningless (example: Δῶρος without its first syllable yields the nonsensical ρος). The second column, which we have almost in its entirety, discusses metaphor. Finally, in the third, examples are produced of ἀφηρεμένον (the final syllable is lost by apocope, lines 15-9: δῶ for δῶμα), ἐπεκτεταμένον (vowel that can be lengthened, lines 19-22: Ἀχιλλήιος for Ἀχίλλειος), συγκεκομμένον (syncope, strike out one or more letters, lines 22-7: θυγατρῶν for θυγατέρων), and ἐξηλλαγμένον sc. ὄνομα (altered word, lines 27-32: λίβανος for λιβανωτός). Snell seeks to identify in *PHamb.* 128 with the remains of the lost first book of Theophrastus' Περὶ λέξεως. His hypothesis has aroused the skepticism of Innes⁴⁷ and previously of Janko,⁴⁸ and was excluded by Schenkeveld.⁴⁹ The editors of the fragments of Theophrastus publish the text of the papyrus, with new textual interventions, in an appendix.⁵⁰ On the other hand, Beta and Calboli reiterated the authorship of Theophrastus and presented concrete, substantial arguments, beginning from an analysis of the discussion of metaphor in column 2.⁵¹ Fortenbaugh is more cautious.⁵² Matelli, finally, goes a step further and proposes that this text be attributed to Praxiphanes (*33a-33c).

I limit myself here to citing the definition of metaphor in column 2 from the translation of the editors of Theophrastus:⁵³

“Among composite nouns and verbs (that remain) the same (or unchanged), (we call) metaphor that which has been transferred from something similar to another thing, e.g., old age (is) ‘the setting of life,’ and the desolate island ‘is bereft of men,’ and a king (is) ‘shepherd of the people.’ (We call) epithet that which is used in conjunction with ordinary words, e.g., ‘blazing’ iron and ‘dazzling’ gold. There is also double and triple (epithet), and (that) in respect to what does not apply, which some call privation, e.g., (double) ‘shield-bearing,’ ‘Ares-lover;’

⁴⁶ Snell (1954).

⁴⁷ Innes (1985).

⁴⁸ Janko (1991) 49 n. 224.

⁴⁹ Schenkeveld (1993).

⁵⁰ FHS&G (1992) II 612-15 (Appendix 9).

⁵¹ Beta in in Guidorizzi-Beta (2000) and Calboli (2007).

⁵² Fortenbaugh (2005).

⁵³ But I have modified the first sentence according to Fortenbaugh (2005) 259.

triple epithet ‘grape-fruit-productive,’ and ‘stars-crystal-bright;’ and that which is not in respect to what does apply: ‘footless,’ ‘wingless.’ Men classify *metousia* from what follows in two ways: sometimes from genus to species and sometimes from species to genus, e.g., from genus to species, when...”

While Innes is convinced that the papyrus yields the remains of a work of the early Peripatos, she doubts that the author is Theophrastus, in consideration of the close similarities between the papyrus and Aristotle’s *Poetics*. (These similarities did not escape Snell, who used them as the basis for his reconstruction of damaged sections of the papyrus.)⁵⁴ The most significant difference from Aristotle is found in the discussion of metaphor, where μεταφορά denotes the metaphor based on analogy, and a new term, μετουσία, is created to indicate the kinds of metaphor that are not based on analogy. If this innovation had been introduced by Theophrastus, it would be difficult to explain the absence of the term μετουσία in the latter discussions of metaphor.⁵⁵

Elaborating on Innes’ observation, Schenkeveld stresses that, in subsequent discussions, rather than μετουσία we find instead metonymy and synecdoche. Furthermore, he asks why Demetrius, the author of *Περὶ ἑρμηνείας*, who referred extensively to Theophrastus, never uses the term μετουσία. On the basis of these criticisms, Schenkeveld excludes Theophrastean authorship and seeks to identify the fragments of the papyrus with one of the τέχναι γραμματικά devoted to the study of poetic language, or else with an anonymous *Ars poetica* of the Hellenistic Age. Schenkeveld concludes that, as for the authorship, we may consider one of those authors close to Theophrastus (Θεόφραστος καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν γεγραφότες) who, like him, dealt with the elements of discourse (περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων), who were attacked by Porphyry in his lost writings on Aristotle’s *Categories* (ἐν τε τῷ πρὸς Γερδάλειον καὶ ἐν τῷ κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ ἀπόκρισιν καὶ τῶν κατηγορουμένων), of which Simplicius speaks at the beginning of his *Commentary on the Categories*.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ See also Janko (1984/2002) 177, 180-1.

⁵⁵ Innes (1985) 252. Cf. Fortenbaugh (2005) 265-6.

⁵⁶ Simpl. *In Arist. Cat.* p. 10.20-11.2 Kalbfleisch (CAG 8). Porph. fr. 46F Smith = Thphr. 683 FHS&G. A passage that Matelli would attribute to Praxiphanes (*32) – to be identified with one of the οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν (sc. Theophrastus) γεγραφότες – and that she believes is closely related to the Hamburg papyrus.

Chiron has given an interesting response to Schenkeveld's question.⁵⁷ He writes that the Hamburg papyrus shows “qu’au tournant du III^e et II^e siècles av. J.-C. la notion de métaphore était démembrée en métaphore proprement dite (réduite à la métaphore par analogie) et en μετουσία (participation), où il faut sans doute voir l’ancêtre du couple métonymie/synecdoque. On a vu ... que la restriction de la métaphore à la métaphore par analogie constituait la meilleure explication au rejet des métaphores fondées sur la simple ressemblance (§ 88 [de Démétrios]). C’est un point de contact entre Démétrios et l’état de la théorie à la fin du III^e siècle qui n’est pas négligeable et qui tend à montrer que, sur la métaphore aussi, Démétrios a utilisé des sources intermédiaires entre Aristote et lui.” Acknowledging that μετουσία is the “ancestor” of metonymy and synecdoche evidently allows us to neutralize Schenkeveld's objections.

Bearing in mind these elements and adding others of his own, Calboli, following Beta,⁵⁸ denies that the papyrus can be considered as evidence of one of the numerous τέχναι ποιητικάί that circulated in the Alexandrian world, and he defends the authorship of Theophrastus, or at least of a Peripatetic author active between Aristotle and the rhetorician Demetrius.⁵⁹

In particular, Calboli emphasizes the three following points:⁶⁰ 1. The text of the papyrus is closely related to chapter 21 of Aristotle's *Poetics*. The most important innovation relative to Aristotle consists in reducing two of the four types of metaphor, namely that from genus to species and from species to genus (ἀπὸ γένους ἐπὶ εἶδος and ἀπὸ εἶδους ἐπὶ γένος), to μετουσία. 2. Elements in the papyrus correspond, although not completely, with the doctrine of the *virtutues dicendi* and of the τέχναι ποιητικάί in particular those that of ἑλληνισμός that Porphyry, who is quoted by Simplicius, attributes to Theophrastus and to his followers. 3. The presence of quotations of examples by poets is not inappropriate in a work on rhetorical argument.

Fortenbaugh in his usefull commentary is more sceptic.⁶¹ “One wants” – he says – “to know who the author of the material contained

⁵⁷ Chiron (2001) 214-5.

⁵⁸ Beta in Guidorizzi-Beta (2000) 165-70.

⁵⁹ Calboli (2007) 137-46.

⁶⁰ Calboli (2007) 140.

⁶¹ Fortenbaugh (2005) 254-66.

in the papyrus may have been and in particular whether he was Theophrastus. In favor of the Eresian are the early date of papyrus (250-200 BC) and the closeness of the papyrus to Aristotle's *Poetics* 20-1. It suggests that the author was an early Peripatetic who was influenced by and building on the work of Aristotle. Among the possible candidates, Theophrastus stands out... The several difficulties involved in the section on metaphor, especially the (apparently) mindless use of συνθέτων and the imprecision concerning similarity (lines 39-41), may be thought to speak against attributing the papyrus to Theophrastus. But then again, great minds sometimes fail, and copyists can make a mess of what had once been an admirable text" (265-6).

According to Janko, the Hamburg papyrus is "certainly not by Aristotle, but quite probably of Theophrastus."⁶²

Finally, Matelli maintains that there are two reasons to include the papyrus among the fragments of Praxiphanes: its chronology (it was copied around 200 BCE in Egypt, a country with which Praxiphanes had close contacts)⁶³ and its grammatical classification based on chapters 20 to 22 in Aristotle's *Poetics*.

There is no evidence that can cast doubt on the Peripatetic origin of the fragments transmitted by the Hamburg papyrus. The decision to attribute it to Theophrastus or to Praxiphanes lies with the editors of the fragments of these two authors. Matelli has thus done well to revive the debate and to recall our attention to the possible authorship of Praxiphanes.

5. Conclusion

Let me to repeat in a brief conclusion the results of my investigation of some aspects of the epigraphical and papyrological tradition of Praxiphanes. The renewed proposal to identify the Praxiphanes mentioned in an honorific Delian inscription with the Peripatetic philosopher contributes to the reconstruction of his chronology.

The remains of *Philistas*, by the first generation Epicurean Carneiscus, highlight the (contentious) relations among Praxiphanes, Epicurus, and the members of the Garden, but they also make it possible to reconstruct some aspects of Praxiphanes' opinions on friendship and to attribute to him a work possibly titled Περὶ φιλίας.

⁶² Janko (2011) 406. Cf. 361 n. 6.

⁶³ Snell (1954) 49. Merkelbach (1956) 108 would shift the date to around 250 BCE.

Another treatise by Praxiphanes, *On poems*, is mentioned in the fifth book of Philodemus' Περὶ ποιημάτων. In this work, Praxiphanes may have expounded, among other things, his aesthetic ideas about the debate over the relationship between content and form in poetic works.

If the text transmitted by the Hamburg papyrus 128 is really to be ascribed to Praxiphanes, we will have another piece of his thought regarding, at least, the treatment of metaphor in the work of the members of the post-Aristotelian and post-Theophrastean Peripatos.

Works cited

- Brink, K.O., "Callimachus and Aristotle: An Inquiry into Callimachus' πρὸς Πραξιφάνους," *CQ* 40: 11-26.
- Calboli, G. 2007. "The Metaphor after Aristotle," in Mirhady, D.C., *Influences on Peripatetic Rhetoric*. Essays in Honor of W.W. Fortenbaugh (Leiden: Brill): 123-50.
- Capasso, M. 1984. "Prassifane, Epicuro e Filodemo. A proposito di Diog. Laert. X 13 e Philod. *Poem.* V IX 10-X 1," *Elenchos* 5: 391-415.
- . 1988. *Carneisco. Il secondo libro del Filista* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Chiron, P. 2001. *Un rhéteur méconnu: Démétrios (Ps.-Démétrios de Phalère). Essai sur les mutations de la théorie du style à l'époque hellénistique* (Paris: Vrin).
- Crönert, W. 1906. *Kolotes und Menedemos* (Leipzig: Avenarius).
- De Witt, N.G. 1954. *Epicurus and his Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Dorandi, T. 1993. art. "Carneiscos" in Goulet, R., *Dictionnaire des Philosophes antiques* 2: 227-8.
- . 1999. "Chronology," in Algra, K., Barnes, J., Mansfeld, J., Schofield, M., *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (Cambridge: CUP): 31-54.
- Dürnbach, F. 1904. "Fouilles de Délos (1902). Inscriptions (1)," *BCH* 28: 93-188.
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. 2005. *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary Volume 8. Sources on Rhetoric and Poetics (Texts 666-713)* (Leiden - Boston: Brill).
- Guidorizzi, G., Beta, S. 2000. *La metafora* (Pisa: ETS).

- Haake, M. 2007. *Der Philosoph in der Stadt: Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistischen Poleis* (München: Beck).
- Innes, D.C. 1985. "Theophrastus and the Theory of Style," in Fortenbaugh, W.W., Long, A., Huby, P., *Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Works* (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers) 215-67.
- Jacoby, F. 1902. *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Janko, R. 1984/2002. *Aristotle On Comedy. Towards a Reconstruction of Poetics II* (London: Duckworth).
- . 1991. "Philodemus' *On Poems* and Aristotle' *On Poets*," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 21: 5-64.
- . 2011. *Philodemus On Poems Books 3-4 With the Fragments of Aristotle On Poets* (Oxford: University press).
- Jensen, Chr. 1923/1973. *Philodemos Über die Gedichte fünftes Buch* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Laks, A. 1976. *Édition critique et commentée de la 'Vie d'Épicure' dans Diogène Laërce (X, 1-34)*, in Bollack, J., Laks, A., *Études sur l'Épicurisme antique* (Lille: PUL): 1-118.
- Lundon, J. 1999. Praxiphanes 86 2-3T, in *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini I. I**** (Firenze: Olschki): 639-47.
- Manetti, D., Montanari, F. 1999. Praxiphanes 86 4T, in *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini I. I**** (Firenze: Olschki): 647-51.
- Mangoni, C. 1993. *Filodemo. Il quinto libro della Poetica (PHerc. 1425 e 1538)* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Merkelbach, R. 1956. "Literarische Texte unter Auschluß der Christlichen," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 16: 82-126.
- Rostagni, A. 1923/1955. "Filodemo contro l'estetica classica. I: Composizione e nesso logico del V libro Περὶ ποιημάτων," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* n.s. 1: 433-70 = *Scritti minori. I: Aesthetica* (Torino: La Bottega di Erasmo): 255-322.
- . 1926-7/1955. "Il dialogo aristotelico Περὶ ποιητῶν," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* n.s. 4: 401-23 = *Aesthetica*: 394-416.
- Salvadori Baldascino, L. (1990). "Mnasilaos oppure Mnasilas," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 20: 65-66.
- Schenkeveld, D.M. 1993. "Pap. Hamburg. 128: An Hellenistic *Ars Poetica*," *ZPE* 97: 67-80.

- Snell, B. 1954. "Theophrast περὶ λέξεως I?," in *Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek* (Hamburg: J.J. Augustin): 36-51.
- Wehrli, F. 1969. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Vol. 9, *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes*. 2nd ed. (Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von 1920. *Platon*. 2nd ed. (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Wilhelm, A. (1905). "Praxiphanes," *Jahreshefte des Österr. Archäol. Instituts* 8: 1-5.
- Zucker, F. 1927. "Zur Textherstellung und Erklärung von Philodems V. Buch Περὶ ποιημάτων, mit einem Exkurs über εὐρησιλογεῖν, εὐρησιλογία, εὐρησίλογος," *Philologus* 82: 243-67.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

8

“Praxiphanes of Rhodes held the same opinions as Theophrastus” (Epiphanius, *De fide* 9.38)

Robert W. Sharples †

1. Epiphanius' report as a whole

Ian Kidd has remarked of Epiphanius that “in general the comments of the bishop of Salamis do not inspire confidence,”¹ and Diels devotes p. 175 of the introduction to *Doxographi Graeci* to a listing of Epiphanius' errors and misunderstandings which, even though cast in the decent obscurity of a learned language, comprehensively destroys any claims to scholarship Epiphanius might have had. However, Diels also recognises that the quality of what we find in an author like Epiphanius is to some extent dependent on the quality of his sources at any given point, even if this can be no guarantee – an author like Epiphanius can make a mess even of material from a reliable source.

Our concern is with a passage which is problematic in various ways.

T1. Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ Νικομάχου, κατὰ μέν τινας Μακεδῶν ἀπὸ Σταγείρων, ὡς δὲ ἔνιοι Θράξ ἦν τὸ γένος. ἔλεγε δὲ δύο ἀρχὰς εἶναι, θεὸν καὶ ὕλην, καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑπεράνω τῆς σελήνης θείας προνοίας τυγχάνειν, τὰ δὲ κάτωθεν τῆς σελήνης ἀπρονόητα ὑπάρχειν καὶ φορᾶ

¹ Edelstein and Kidd (1988-1989) vol. 2.ii, 642. See Sharples (1998) 104-105 and nn.

464 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

τινι ἀλόγῳ φέρεσθαι ὡς ἔτυχεν. εἶναι δὲ λέγει δύο κόσμους, τὸν ἄνω καὶ τὸν κάτω, καὶ τὸν μὲν ἄνω ἀφθαρτον, τὸν δὲ κάτω φθαρτόν. καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐνδελέχειαν σώματος λέγει. Θεόφραστος Ἐρέσιος τὰ αὐτὰ Ἀριστοτέλει ἐδόξασε. Στράτων [ὦν] ἐκ Λαμψάκου τὴν θερμὴν οὐσίαν ἔλεγεν αἰτίαν πάντων ὑπάρχειν. ἄπειρα δὲ ἔλεγεν εἶναι τὰ μέρη τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ πᾶν ζῶον ἔλεγε νοῦ δεκτικὸν εἶναι. Πραξιφάνης Ῥόδιος τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Θεοφράστῳ ἐδόξασε. Κριτόλαος ὁ Φασηλίτηστὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει ἐδόξασε.

Epiphanius, *De fide* 9.35-9, t.3 p.508.4-15 Holl & Dummer

1-11 Diels, *Dox.* 592.9-20; Theophrastus 162 FHS&G; Praxiphanes **19** Matelli (fr. 2 Wehrli) 1-6 et 11 Critolaus, fr. 15 Wehrli 7-9 Strato 47 Sharples (fr. 48 Wehrli)

Aristotle, son of Nicomachus, was a Macedonian from Stagira according to some, but a Thracian in race according to others. He said that there are two principles, god and matter, and that the things above the moon are objects of divine providence, but the things below the moon exist without providence and are borne along in some irrational motion as chance has it. He says that there are two world-orders, that above and that below, and that that (which is) above is imperishable, but that (which is) below is subject to passing-away. And he says that the soul is the continuous activity of the body.

Theophrastus of Eresus held the same opinions as Aristotle.

Strato of Lampsacus said that the hot substance was the cause of all things. He said that the parts of the world are infinite² and that every living creature is capable of possessing intellect.

Praxiphanes of Rhodes held the same opinions as Theophrastus.

Critolaus of Phaselus held the same opinions as Aristotle.

T1 comes from the final section of Epiphanius' work, the essay on the Catholic faith, which follows the listing of all the heresies. The structure of Epiphanius' work is a topic that will concern us again later. T1 reports, explicitly or by implication, the views of various Peripatetics. The report of Aristotle's views, as has long been noted, has similarities with the much fuller account in Diogenes Laertius book 5, and appears to come from a Hellenistic source; of this, too, more later.

What is at first sight odd about the structure of Epiphanius' report is the statements that Theophrastus thought the same as Aristotle, Praxiphanes the same as Theophrastus, and Critolaus the same as Aristotle. Since thinking the same as someone else is a logically transitive

² i.e., matter is infinitely divisible?

relation, it would seem to follow that Critolaus thought the same as Praxiphanes. So, why not say so?

In a previous discussion I attempted to answer that question by a historical reconstruction. My suggestion³ was that Epiphanius' report, or rather the report that served as Epiphanius' source, was not a single compilation but rather the result of a process of accretion. If the original version ended with Praxiphanes, it would not have involved the oddity to which I have drawn attention. If, moreover, that original version was due to Critolaus, reporting the views of Aristotle as he interpreted them and singling out Strato as unorthodox compared to other Peripatetics, then it would be natural for a later source, taking it over, to add that Critolaus agreed with Aristotle – though, as we can perhaps see more clearly than the ancient source could, that statement is in a sense a truism, since the Aristotle with whom Critolaus was expressing agreement was Aristotle as Critolaus himself interpreted him. Or perhaps we should express the point by saying that what it amounts to is that Critolaus professed loyalty to Aristotle, and that Critolaus' approach to philosophical argument was that one engages in philosophy by interpreting the views of an authority – which is itself interesting for the place of Critolaus in the development of ancient approaches to philosophy in general and of Aristotelianism in particular; it presents him as anticipating the first century BC rather than looking back to the third. But that is an issue I have discussed elsewhere⁴ and hope to develop in future. I will however add here that if Diogenes' account as a whole accurately reflects Critolaus, it hardly redounds to Critolaus' credit. Bodéüs 1995 has argued, against Moraux, that the first part, in particular, of Diogenes' account reflects not confusion but the results of an attempt, inspired by Stoicism, to systematise Aristotle's philosophy retrospectively. That indeed puts Diogenes' source at the start of a process perhaps more often associated with the commentators from Andronicus onwards,⁵ and in particular Alexander. But it does not

³ Mueller (1995) 155 cites Wehrli (1969²) 64 and 66 as proposing Critolaus as originator of the doctrine of providence attributed to Aristotle; that is not in any case quite the same as saying he is the source of the whole report. Mueller rejects the argument on the grounds that others are mentioned between Aristotle and Critolaus. But in fact Wehrli does not seem to make this claim on either of the pages cited.

⁴ Sharples (2006) 323-324.

⁵ Who Bodéüs (1995) 579-580 argues were still influenced by the initial, misguided Stoicising approach.

follow that Diogenes' source carried out this task with the scholarly attention to detail that we find in Alexander – and indeed Bodéüs himself points out (1995, 576) that Diogenes' source was happy to distinguish between the contents of the *Prior* and the *Posterior Analytics* without any knowledge of the actual contents of either.

To return to Epiphanius. If the interpretation given above is right, it follows that the report of Aristotle's views in fact gives us those of Critolaus. Wehrli (vol. 10, 66) denied that it does so; his reasons for doing so are in my view weak, but I want to mention them briefly because they will be relevant when we come to Praxiphanes. Epiphanius, in the earlier part of his work, which is the chief target of Diels's disapproval, repeatedly identifies Peripatetics with Pythagoreans, giving the four Greek philosophical schools as Pythagoreans or Peripatetics, Platonists, Stoics and Epicureans.⁶ The wording of one of these passages is significant, for it refers to "Pythagoreans or indeed Peripatetics, divided by (the associates of) Aristotle."⁷ Williams interprets this as meaning "divided (from Hellenism) by Aristotle," "Hellenism" being Epiphanius' term for Greek paganism generally, so that Aristotle would be responsible for the distinctive features of the Pythagorean and Peripatetic traditions;⁸ that this was Epiphanius' understanding of the matter gains some support from T2 below. But it is not entirely clear that the passage should not rather be understood as describing Aristotle and his school as a breakaway from the Pythagoreans. One of the passages in Epiphanius indicates the doctrines of the alleged Pythagorean and Peripatetic school; there is one god, there is reincarnation of souls, and god is a body, identified with the heaven.

T2. Πυθαγόρειοι, ἀπὸ Ἑλληνισμοῦ αἵρεσις ἐ', τῆς δὲ ἀκολουθίας ζ'.
Πρὸ δὲ τούτου Πυθαγόρας καὶ οἱ Περιπατητικὴν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι
χαρακτηρίζουσιν ἓνα θεόν, φιλοσοφίαις δὲ ἄλλαις * καὶ τοῖς *

⁶ Epiphanius, *Panarion*, prologue 1. 3.3, GCS t. 1 157.6, prologue 1. 5.3 t. 1 p. 159.25 Holl, *haer.* 7 t. 1 p. 186.2 Holl = Diels, *Dox.* 588.30. At [Epiphanius], *Anacephaleosis* 1.3.8, p. 164.10 Holl, the four schools are given but with reference only to the Pythagoreans and not also to the Peripatetics. Epiphanius follows no canonical order of the four schools; in fact the order is different in each of the first three passages cited (the order at 164.10 is the same as at 157.6). Cf. Wehrli (1969b) 66.

⁷ Πυθαγόρειοι εἴτ' οὖν Περιπατητικοί, διὰ τὸν περὶ Ἀριστοτέλην διαιρεθῆσαι. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, prologue 1.3.3 t.1 p.157.6-7 Holl. As commonly, "the associates of" (οἱ περί) may simply be a periphrasis for the thinker mentioned himself.

⁸ Williams (1994).

φιλοσοφούμενοις προσανέχουσι. τὰ ἴσα μὲν τούτοις πάλιν τὰ τῆς ἀθεμίτου γνώμης καὶ ἀσεβεστάτης, τῶν ψυχῶν ἀπαθανatismoύς τε καὶ μετενσωματώσεις καὶ σωμάτων φθοράς, αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἀγορεύουσιν. οὗτος δὲ τέλος ἐν τῇ Μηδίᾳ τὸν βίον καταστρέφει. σῶμα δὲ λέγει εἶναι τὸν θεὸν τουτέστιν οὐρανόν, ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὥσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἄστρα καὶ τὰ κατ’ οὐρανὸν στοιχεῖα.

Epiphanius, *Panarion*, haer. 7, t. 1 p. 186.1-10 Holl.

The Pythagoreans, the fifth sect starting from “Hellenism,” the seventh of the whole sequence. Before (Plato), Pythagoras and those who professed the Peripatetic (philosophy) fashioned a single god, and in other aspects of philosophy they adhered to the doctrines of the philosophers. Equally with these he and his followers too proclaim what belongs to a godless and most impious opinion, the immortality and transmigration of souls and the destruction of the body. He finally met the end of his life in Media. He said that god is a body, that is the heaven, and that his eyes and other (parts), as of a human being, are the sun and the moon and the other stars and the elements in the heaven.

A further text, from one of the *Summaries* generally thought not to be by Epiphanius himself, gives a list of the alleged Pythagorean or Peripatetic doctrines, which is mainly Pythagorean (the monad, vegetarianism, transmigration of souls into animals, observation of silence) but includes a reference to providence, not further elaborated, and the distinction between an imperishable superlunary and a perishable sublunary realm.

T3. Πυθαγόρειοι εἴτ’ οὖν Περιπατητικοί· τὴν μονάδα καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν καὶ τὸ κωλύειν θύεσθαι τοῖς δῆθεν θεοῖς Πυθαγόρας ἐδογμάτισεν, ἐμψύχων τε μὴ μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀπὸ οἴνου δὲ ἐγκρατεύεσθαι. διώριζεν δὲ ἅμα τὰ ἀπὸ σελήνης [καὶ] ἄνω ἀθάνατα λέγων, τὰ δὲ ὑποκάτω θνητά· μεταγγισμούς τε ψυχῶν ἀπὸ σωμάτων εἰς σώματα ἄχρι ζώων καὶ κνωδάλων, σιωπὴν δὲ ἅμα ἀσκεῖν ἐπὶ χρόνον πέντε ἐτῶν ἐδίδασκε. τὸ τελευταῖον δὲ ἑαυτὸν θεὸν ὠνόμασε.

[Epiphanius], *Anacephalaeosis* 1.5.1-2, t. 1 p. 165.5-11 Holl = Diels, Dox. 587.2.

Pythagoreans or Peripatetics. Pythagoras’ doctrines were the monad and providence and prohibition on sacrificing to the supposed gods, abstaining from (food) that had a soul, and self-control in refraining from wine. He also made a distinction saying that things extending upwards from the moon are immortal but those beneath it mortal. He taught that souls were decanted from some bodies into others right down to animals and beasts, and that one should practice silence for up to five years. And finally he called himself a god.

Wehrli used Epiphanius' identification of Peripatetics and Pythagoreans to suggest that the report of Aristotle in our text comes not from Critolaus but from a source similar to the extant treatise of Ocellus Lucanus.⁹ Wehrli further argues that the statement that Critolaus agreed with Aristotle is shown to be false by Cicero, *De finibus* 5.14 (Critolaus fr. 11 Wehrli). But Cicero's statement is in a specifically ethical context, whereas our text is concerned with physics.¹⁰ Moreover, while there are indeed points of contact between Epiphanius' report of Aristotle and Ocellus Lucanus,¹¹ they involve positions that can reasonably be regarded as Aristotelian; it is at least possible that, as Theiler suggested,¹² (i) Critolaus' interpretation of Aristotle influenced Ocellus, rather than (ii) Ocellus' treatise or one similar to it giving Epiphanius a false view of Aristotle-as-interpreted-by-Critolaus. If (ii) is the case, Epiphanius or his source will have used Ocellus – who, after all, presents what he says as Pythagorean, not as Aristotelian – as a source for Aristotle because of the misguided belief that Peripatetics and Pythagoreans were the same; if Critolaus influenced Ocellus and Epiphanius by separate routes, then we do not need to make this particular supposition. Not to do so does indeed mean attributing one less blunder to Epiphanius; perhaps we should be prepared to be charitable to him this time at least.

There is one further point that we may note before leaving issues relating to Epiphanius. Williams has suggested¹³ that the source of our text in T1 from *On Faith* may be the same as that for heresies 5-8, the Greek philosophical schools, in the earlier part of the work. The details of the Peripatetic, or Pythagorean, position are not quite the same in the two places, but this *could* be explained by differing selection from a common source in the two passages. Caution may however be in order, for the structure of the account in *On Faith* is different from that of Epiphanius' work as a whole; in the former Pythagoras is mentioned two *Doxographi Graeci* pages earlier than Aristotle, and Plato precedes the Stoics rather than, as in the work as a whole, following them – in both senses of that term, though in doctrine not completely. It also seems to me that the Greek of T1 is less idiosyncratic than that of

⁹ Wehrli (1969²) 66.

¹⁰ As Wehrli (1969) 64 indeed notes. Moreover, that Cicero states a divergence between Critolaus and Aristotle depends on Bremius' insertion of <ne>.

¹¹ Cf. Sharples (2006) 320-322.

¹² Theiler (1926) 153-154.

¹³ Williams (1994) 650 n.44.

T2 and T3, which may be a sign of a different source or of Epiphanius’ own input in the case of the latter. At any rate, I should issue a cautionary note that the degree of muddle that we find in T2 and T3 should not necessarily be taken as reflecting on the credentials of T1.

Returning to the structure of our text, however, there are at least two other possible explanations of the structural oddity in T1 to which I drew attention at the outset. One is that it may be an artificial product of the process of reducing the account to its present summary form; perhaps the original said more about each philosopher – and perhaps it included more philosophers, an issue to which I shall return – and perhaps the successive occurrences of “thought the same as” were qualified in ways that made the choice of specific links seem less arbitrary. More interesting in the context of the present discussion, though, is the third possible explanation. Praxiphanes was Theophrastus’ pupil; it is therefore entirely natural to say that Praxiphanes thought the same as Theophrastus, even if it follows that he thought the same as Aristotle as well. On the other hand there is as far as I am aware no specific link between Critolaus and Praxiphanes, with one possible exception to which I will come shortly; so, even though the logic of Epiphanius’ report implies that “Critolaus thought the same as Praxiphanes,” it would be less natural to say this than it would be to say that Praxiphanes thought the same as his teacher Theophrastus.

2. Epiphanius as evidence for Praxiphanes?

This brings us to our central concern in the present context; what are we to make of the inclusion of *Praxiphanes* in Epiphanius’ report? Why is he there along with other Peripatetics all of whom are arguably better known to philosophers in general, even if not to literary specialists? And, what if anything does Epiphanius’ report add to our knowledge of Praxiphanes’ philosophical views?

On the first question, why Praxiphanes is included at all, there is one possible answer that does not seem to be the right one, unless we suppose that the list was once more comprehensive. The inclusion of Praxiphanes does not seem to reflect a specific connection of the list with the island of Rhodes. For the report does not include other notable Peripatetics from Rhodes such as Eudemus and, later, Andronicus. In this it is to be contrasted with the list in the *Vita Aristotelis Menagiana*, otherwise known as the life by Hesychius, which is presented as a list of successors of Aristotle as head of the school but is in fact a list of

470 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

prominent Aristotelians. For that list, which includes Praxiphanes, also includes Hieronymus and Andronicus.

T5. διάδοχοι δ' αὐτοῦ τῆς σχολῆς κατὰ τάξιν ἐβένοντο οἷδε· Θεόφραστος, Στράτων, Πραξιτέλης, Λύκων, Ἀρίστων, Λυκίσκος, Πραξιφάνης, Ἱερώνυμος, Πρύτανις, Φορμίων, Κριτόλαος.

Vita Aristotelis Hesychii 9 (AABT 82.18-21 Düring 1957)

1-3 *Vita Aristotelis Menagiana* p. 402.20-23 Westermann; *Aristoteles, Fragmenta* p. 10.19-22 Rose³; *Theophrastus fr. 11 no. 7 FHS&G*; *Strato fr. 5B Sharples*, (fr. 3 Wehrli); *Lyco fr. 3B SFOD* (fr. 6 Wehrli); *Aristo Ceus, fr. 4A SFOD* (fr. 7 Wehrli); *Praxiphanes 3C Matelli* (fr. 3 Wehrli); *Hieronymus, fr. 3A White* (fr. 2 Wehrli); *Critolaus fr. 3 Wehrli*

(Aristotle's) successors in the school were in order the following: Theophrastus, Strato, Praxiteles, Lyco, Aristo, Lyciscus, Praxiphanes, Hieronymus, Prytanis, Phormio, Critolaus.

It is true that Critolaus came from Phaselis, which was a Rhodian colony, but to use this to argue for a specifically Rhodian character in Epiphanius' list, and then use this to explain the inclusion of Praxiphanes, seems dubious. The four Peripatetics – after Aristotle himself – who appear in Epiphanius' list are in the same order there as in the fuller Menagiana list, but, with only four names of whom the first two are the second and third heads of the school and the last is a century and a half later, it would be risky to use this to argue that Epiphanius' list is a cut-down version of the Menagiana one. The order of the Menagiana list could indeed be explained in part by suggesting that it lists first those active in Athens and then those active in Rhodes, returning to Critolaus at the end; but this does not account for Praxiteles, Lyciscus, Prytanis and Phormio,¹⁴ and it is odd that the list should return to Critolaus at the

¹⁴ White (2004) 101 suggests that Aristo, Lyciscus and Praxiphanes, together with Hieronymus, come at this point in the list as contemporaries of Lyco. Not much is known about any of the four named in the text. Praxiteles and Lyciscus are not in *RE* and Lyciscus is not in the *Dictionnaire des Philosophes antiques* (yet to reach P at the time of writing). Prytanis [(5) in *RE* 27.1 (1957) 158 Ziegler], instituted laws for Megalopolis after 222 BC. Phormio [8 in *RE* 20.1 (1940) 540 Brink] is dated by Brink to c. 200 BC and described by him as scholarch in Athens between Aristo and Critolaus according to the *Vita Menagiana*. Lynch (1972) 141 n. 12 notes that Praxiphanes and Hieronymus cannot have been scholarchs at Athens on chronological grounds, and,

end, given that he was best known as active in Athens. If a list of heads of an Aristotelian school in Rhodes is behind part of the list it is odd that Eudemus himself should be missing,¹⁵ though Hans Gottschalk has argued against seeing a connection between Eudemus and subsequent Peripatetic activity in Rhodes.¹⁶

As Elisabetta Matelli has emphasised to me, the sequence of Peripatetics in Epiphanius' report is the same as that in *PDuke* inv. 178 (3A). That is a simple list of names with no comments at all about the doctrines held by the individuals named. What does this parallel add to our assessment of Epiphanius' report? Unless the papyrus itself depends on Epiphanius,¹⁷ it shows us that the cutting down of the report to these and only these names, if that is what happened, was not Epiphanius' own doing. It also shows us that either the papyrus derived from a list that included doctrinal reports omitted by the papyrus, or else Epiphanius' source added doctrinal reports to a pre-existing list that did not itself contain them. The former seems more likely. But beyond that the parallel between the two texts does not seem to take us much further. It does not tell us whether the common source, or an earlier source on which it in turn depended, contained more doctrinal information than has reached us in Epiphanius' version. And it does not answer the question that particularly concerns us; does the statement that Praxiphanes thought the same as Theophrastus represent a responsible summarising of fuller information about the views of both of them, once present in the tradition that led to our text but now lost? Does it depend on someone's having had good information about the views of both of them for other sources? Or does it simply reflect the fact that Praxiphanes was Theophrastus' pupil?

What then can Epiphanius' report tell us about Praxiphanes's views? For Wehrli, at least, the answer seems to be: nothing. For in his collection of the testimonia relating to Praxiphanes he includes it under “Life,” and in his commentary (105) he discusses it only in connection with Praxiphanes' having been a pupil of Theophrastus and with the question of Praxiphanes' origin, arguing, reasonably enough, that

while conceding that one or two of the others named might have been, clearly indicates that he considers this unlikely.

¹⁵ On Hieronymus, Praxiphanes and the school in Rhodes see Matelli (2004) 303.

¹⁶ Gottschalk (2002) 26-27: “Probably Eudemus' school did not survive him.”

¹⁷ Which seems unlikely; the papyrus was written by Ammon Scholasticus, fl. 348 (<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/178.html>), while Epiphanius' work against heresies was written in 374-376.

Praxiphanes was born in Mytilene, as other reports indicate, but worked in Rhodes, presumably after studying with Theophrastus in Athens.¹⁸ Brink (1946), 23 and n. 3, uses the fact that Epiphanius' report as a whole is about (as Brink puts it) metaphysics and physics to support his general argument that Praxiphanes is to be seen as a philosopher rather than as a literary critic; but this argument is only as strong as the original source's justification for including Praxiphanes in this philosophical list, and in any case tells us nothing about the specific philosophical views that might have been at issue.

One question we should ask, for purposes of comparison, is whether Epiphanius' report is a reliable guide to *Theophrastus'* views. Admittedly, even if the views attributed to Aristotle, with which Theophrastus is said by Epiphanius to have agreed, did happen to correspond with Theophrastus' views known from elsewhere, that might be by accident.¹⁹ And even if Epiphanius got Theophrastus right by accident, there is no reason to suppose he need have been lucky in the case of Praxiphanes as well. In fact, of the three views attributed to Aristotle, the first, that god and matter are the two principles, is one that Theophrastus (fr. 230 FHS&G) attributed to Plato, but not one that he held himself. Whether Theophrastus drew a sharp distinction between the heavens and the sub-lunary, even if not putting it in terms of providence, is bound up with the question whether he continued to believe in the separate Aristotelian heavenly element, the *aither*; the evidence here is complex, but I am inclined to believe he did.²⁰ That he regarded the soul as "continuity" is also asserted by Iamblichus (Theophrastus fr. 269 FHS&G); there are well-known problems about both the terminology in general and the interpretation of Iamblichus' report in particular, but these have been discussed by others,²¹ and it would take us too far afield to go into them here. At any rate Epiphanius is not totally isolated in his report. As for Strato, the tradition leading to Epiphanius presumably had some separate source of information concerning him, unless it is just compression and omission that has led to the fact that he alone, apart from Aristotle,

¹⁸ Aly (1954) 1769 considers Epiphanius' report only in connection with Praxiphanes' origin.

¹⁹ As Conybeare, cited by Runia (1993) 228, said of another Christian writer who referred to pagan philosophy in polemic against heretics, Hippolytus, "if such a writer ever told the truth, at least of his enemies, it must have been by accident."

²⁰ See the discussion in Sharples (1998) 88-94.

²¹ Cf. Huby (1999) 18-20 with references.

has distinctive views attributed to him. Interestingly enough, each of the points attributed to him by Epiphanius can be related to a view he actually held, but only by exercising a degree of charity and allowing the report to be only partial. He held, not that the hot *substance* was the cause of all things, but that hot *and cold qualities* were the principles.²² He held that matter was infinitely divisible, if that is what is behind the statement that “the parts of the world are infinite.”²³ And Epiphanius was not the only person to interpret his view that sensation takes place in the ruling part of the soul, which in human beings is the intellect, as implying that every living creature can possess intellect.²⁴

The one significant point that Epiphanius’ report might contribute to our picture of Praxiphanes is that it includes him in a list where those to whom specific doctrines are attributed are mentioned for their views on physics. From this we might infer that at any rate Praxiphanes was known to have held views on physics. But even this involves some assumptions. Let us grant that physical doxography and (for example) ethical doxography were distinct genres, and that it is unlikely that a listing with an emphasis on physics should have been created by extracting only physical doctrines from a series of originally fuller reports that was already in list form. (I put it that way, because the comparison with Diogenes Laertius’ report of Aristotle, which covers all three of logic, ethics and physics in that order, suggests that the account of Aristotle’s views on physics may have been extracted from a fuller account at or before the time the ancestor of our list was compiled.) Let us also assume that it is unlikely that anyone would construct a listing of Peripatetic physical theories by taking a short and idiosyncratic list of names compiled for some other purpose, and then attaching physical doctrines to the names. If we grant both these assumptions, we can conclude that the original compiler of the list thought that Praxiphanes’ name belonged in a Peripatetic physical doxography. But we still have to assume that the compiler was right – which may not be so easy, given that this is as far as I am aware the only text suggesting an interest in physics on Praxiphanes’ part; and Epiphanius’ report still gives

²² Strato fr. 45 + 46 Sharples = 42-45 Wehrli.

²³ Zeller (1879) 914 and nn. 2-3, arguing that Epiphanius has misunderstood this to mean that the world is infinite in extent.

²⁴ Plutarch cites Strato’s view in the context of arguing that animals have intelligence: Strato fr. 62 Sharples = fr. 112 Wehrli. For Strato’s view see also frr. 63AB Sharples = 110-111 Wehrli; Sorabji (1993) 46.

us no idea what Praxiphanes' physical doctrines may have been, apart from the statement, which may or may not accurately reflect what was indicated by the original compiler of the list, that he, Aristotle, Theophrastus and Critolaus all agreed with one another.

The outcome of this discussion is, I fear, slight, but it may still be valuable in a negative way. The question whether there were links between Praxiphanes' views and interests and those of Theophrastus needs to be examined on the basis of other evidence.²⁵ Such links may however have little bearing on, and cannot in any way be reliably confirmed by, the particular report by Epiphanius that has provided the subject of this paper.

Works Cited

- Aly, W., 1954. Art. 'Praxiphanes', *RE* 22: 1769-1784.
- Brink, K.O. 1946. "Callimachus and Aristotle," *CQ* 39: 11-26.
- Bodéüs, R. 1995. "L'influence historique du stoïcisme sur l'interprétation de l'oeuvre philosophique d'Aristote," *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 79: 553-586.
- Bodnar, I., Fortenbaugh, W.W., eds. 2002. *Eudemus of Rhodes*. RUSCH 11 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- Edelstein, L., Kidd, I.G. 1988-1989. *Posidonius: The Fragments²/The Commentary*, (Cambridge: University Press).
- Fortenbaugh, W.W., White, S.A., eds. 2004. *Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes*. RUSCH 12 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- . 2006. *Aristo of Ceos*. RUSCH 13 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- Gottschalk, H.B. 2002. "Eudemus and the Peripatos," in Bodnar - Fortenbaugh (2002): 25-37.
- Huby, P.M. 1999. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence, Commentary volume 4, Psychology* (Leiden: Brill).
- Lynch, J.P., 1972. *Aristotle's school; a study of a Greek educational institution* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

²⁵ Aly (1954) 1774-1775 and 1783 draws a link between Praxiphanes' discussion of friendship, reported by Philodemus, and Theophrastus' lost treatise on that topic.

- Matelli, E. 2004. “Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes,” in Fortenbaugh - White (2004): 289-314.
- Mueller, I. 1994. “Hippolytus, Aristotle, Basilides,” in Schrenk (1994): 143-57.
- Runia, D.T. 1993. *Philo in Early Christian Literature* (Assen: Van Gorcum).
- Schrenk, L.P., ed. 1994. *Aristotle in Late Antiquity* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press).
- Sharples, R.W. 1998. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence, Commentary volume 3.1, Sources on Physics*, with contributions on the Arabic material by Dimitri Gutas (Leiden: Brill).
- . 2006. “Natural Philosophy in the Peripatos after Strato,” in Fortenbaugh - White (2006): 307-327.
- Sorabji, R. 1993. *Animal Minds and Human Morals* (London: Duckworth).
- Theiler, W. 1926. Review of A. Delatte, *Études sur la littérature pythagoricienne* and other works, *Gnomon* 2: 147-156.
- Wehrli, F. 1969². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos: Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).
- White, S.A. 2006. “Hieronymus of Rhodes: the Sources, Text and Translation,” in Fortenbaugh - White (2004): 79-276.
- Williams, F. 1987-1994. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* (Leiden: Brill).
- Zeller, E. 1879. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* II.2³ (Leipzig: Fues [Reisland]).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

9

The διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν of Praxiphanes in the testimony of Diogenes Laertius*

Maddalena Vallozza

We can attach few certainties to the name of Praxiphanes. Among these, there emerges a lively attention to issues related to language and to literary production. Wehrli, who has collected twenty-three fragments and testimonia for Praxiphanes, brings most of them together under *Literaturwissenschaft* (8-23 Wehrli).¹ But it is difficult to reconstruct the arguments or even the titles of his works, and even more difficult to understand whether Praxiphanes' activity in this field should be attributed to the tendency, typical of the second generation of Peripatos students, to develop fully their method of inquiry into the works and authors that was cultivated all along in the sphere of the school.² This is the method that is characterized, as is well known, by the reconstruction of the lives of authors from passages of their works, by the accumulation of actual or imagined data, by the use of evidence – especially the

* I would like to thank Glenn Most and Tiziano Dorandi for their valuable comments during the debate. A hearty thanks to David Mirhady for the English translation of my text.

¹ Wehrli (1969a) 93-100. Excellent summary in Dörrie (1972) 1123. Cf. also Corradi (2007).

² An extensive and careful overview in Fortenbaugh (2007) 71-76. An analysis by Montanari (2012) in this volume.

anecdote – that is capable of giving a universal dimension to individual, minor facts, but that is also useful in depicting the *ethos* of the authors. In other words, it is the method that takes its name from Chamaeleon.³ Can we discover any trace of Praxiphanes' adherence to this method, given his recognized attention to literary production? I believe that one response, perhaps minimal, yet significant given the extreme shortage of material, comes from the testimony of Diogenes Laertius on the διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν of Praxiphanes (3. 8 = 11 Wehrli = **22** Matelli), which I propose to analyze in the following pages.⁴ Wehrli sharply circumscribes it in his text, because he does not consider the context at all, and he clothes it with a generic meaning, because he postulates in the διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν a response by Praxiphanes to Plato's so-called attack on poetry, which is as vague as it is difficult to prove.⁵

The testimony of Diogenes Laertius appears in the first part of the *Life of Plato*, and it involves both Plato and Isocrates:⁶

‘Ο δ’ οὖν φιλόσοφος (*scil.* Πλάτων) καὶ Ἰσοκράτει φίλος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτῶν Πραξιφάνης ἀνέγραψε διατριβὴν τινα περὶ ποιητῶν γενομένην ἐν ἀγρῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι ἐπιξευθέντος τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους.

Indeed the philosopher (Plato) was also a friend of Isocrates. And Praxiphanes records a certain discussion about poets taking place at Plato's country place with Isocrates as a guest (trad. Matelli [2012] in this volume).

³ Cf. Arrighetti (1987) 141-148 and Arrighetti (1994) 229-243, and in particular, for the function of the anecdote, Arrighetti (2007) 90-97. Weighted reconstruction of the method of Chamaeleon now in Schorn (2012) in this volume.

⁴ Diogenes Laertius mentions the name of Praxiphanes, as the teacher of a Plato Peripatetic, also in the “rubric” of homonyms in the appendix to the *Life of Plato* (3.109 = **8** Matelli), where there seem to be present personalized connotations similar to those which Sollenberger (2000) 328-329 highlights in the appendix to the *Life of Demetrius of Phalerum* (5.84).

⁵ Wehrli (1969b) 121: “Außerdem hat nach unserer Vermutung Praxiphanes in seinem bekannten Dialog Platons Angriffe auf die Dichtung abgewehrt, nachdem dies schon durch Aristoteles geschehen war.” Cf. the objections of Lefkowitz (1981) 126-27.

⁶ The text is from Marcovich (1999) 197. In the apparatus the fragment has in error number 61 Wehrli, as it does in Gigante (1987) 491, n. 31, and also in Ramelli (2005) 1361, n. 30. Despite Long (1964) 124, Wehrli (1969a) 96 chooses συνέγραψε from P (*Paris. gr.* 1759) in place of ἀνέγραψε of B (*Neapolit. Burb.* III B 29) and of F (*Laur.* 69. 13). A new synthesis of the relationships among the sources of the *Lives* is offered now by Dorandi (2009) 190-195. There is a short, but notable, illustration of the passage in Brisson (1999) 397. Cf. Brisson (1992) 3644-5.

The passage raises numerous problems. In the first place, problems arise from the title, which Diogenes Laertius seems to indicate as Περὶ Ποιητῶν also in relation to the title Περὶ Ποιημάτων of a work in at least two books that Philodemus explicitly attributes to Praxiphanes in the *On Poems* (12. 28-33 Mangoni = 12 Wehrli = **18.2** and **27** Matelli): ἐν [τ]ῷ πρώτῳ περὶ | ποιη[μά]των.⁷

But, as is obvious, the problems principally concern the reconstruction of a profile of the work, to which Wehrli brings, however uncertainly, no less than seven fragments along with the two related to the title (11-17 Wehrli). The fragments, which comprise almost a third of the whole, all bear a more or less extensive literary reflection. These fragments include not only the passage by Demetrius, *On Style* (55-58 = 13 Wehrli = **24** Matelli), which is full of examples on the correct use of particles, σύνδεσμοι, in order to add πάθος and ἔμφασις, but also the lemma by Hesychius, s.v. διατροχάδες (δ 1398 Latte = 14 Wehrli = **31** Matelli), on research related to genres within the sphere of ποιήματα, as well as the well-known Florentine scholium (*PSI* 1219. fr. 1. 7-9 = 15 Wehrli = **10** Matelli), which inserts the name of Praxiphanes into the list of Telchines, who are attacked by Callimachus in the prologue of the *Aetia*. There is also the related information from Achilles, *Life of Aratos* (9. 5-9 Martin = 16 Wehrli = **11** Matelli) on the Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην of Callimachus (fr. 460 Pfeiffer) with a shorter, corresponding Latin version (16. 12-16 Martin = 17 Wehrli = **7** Matelli).⁸

Perhaps the richness and complexity of this material have come to overshadow the importance of the information provided by Diogenes Laertius, which Wehrli appears to have considered only in order to assign a title, however uncertain, to a group of fragments from contents of no small importance, but varied and unfortunately largely elusive. In my opinion, however, a new investigation allows us to grasp, if not the substance of the work, at least a trace of Praxiphanes' adherence to the method of literary analysis typical of the Peripatos.

⁷ Cf. Mangoni (1993) 47-52. A translation of the passage with brief notes also appears in Armstrong (1995) 259.

⁸ Wehrli (1969a) 96-8. Previously, Preller (1842=1864) 94-112 and Brink (1946) 21-2 limited themselves to identifying testimonia and fragments without attempting to attribute them to the few works of Praxiphanes of which the titles are known.

1. The setting: Praxiphanes and the *Phaedrus*

After the essential information on the paideutic *iter* of Plato⁹ – Socrates, and then, in rapid succession, Megara, Cyrene, and Egypt (3.5-6)¹⁰ – Diogenes Laertius devotes ample space (3.7-8) to Plato's return to Athens and his activity in the Academy: ἐπανελθὼν δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας διέτριβεν ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ. He describes it as a wooded suburban school, τὸ δ' ἐστὶ γυμνάσιον προάστειον ἀλσῶδες, and recalls the origin of its name with reference to two quotations. The first is from Eupolis, from the *Astrateutoi* (36 Kassel-Austin):¹¹

ἐν εὐσκίοις δρόμοισιν Ἑκαδήμου θεοῦ.

At the shady running tracks of the divine Hecademus (trad. Storey [2011] 65).

The second is from the *Silloi* of Timon of Phlius (804 Lloyd-Jones-Parsons = 30 Di Marco):

τῶν πάντων δ' ἡγεῖτο πλατίστατος, ἀλλ' ἀγορητῆς
ἡδυεπῆς, τέττιξιν ἰσογράφος, οἳ θ' Ἑκαδήμου
δέινδρει ἐφεζόμενοι ὅπα λειριόεσσαν ἰεῖσιν.

And he led them all, the big mullet, but a sweet-voiced speaker, writing like the cicadas which, sitting on the tree of Ecademus, project their lily-like voices (trad. Clayman [2009] 108)

It is not by chance that I dwell on these quotations. They precede the observation, almost a corollary introduced by the γὰρ, that the name of the Academy was formerly Ἑκαδημία: πρότερον γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ἐ Ἑκαδημία ἐκαλεῖτο.¹² In reality, the role of the two quotations in the

⁹ It is one of the recurrent “basic building blocks” on the basis of which Diogenes Laertius characterizes his subjects. Cf. Sollenberger (1992) 3805-09.

¹⁰ The biographical tradition on the voyages and studies of Plato present similar itineraries, but with differences in the details and in the sequence of events. Swift Riginos (1979) 61-9 discusses this topic. Reconstruction in Erler (2007) 46-51.

¹¹ Or *Androgynoi*, according to the dual title recorded in the *Suda* (ε 3657 = test. 1. 4-5 Kassel-Austin). Regarding the dating of the work, Storey (2003) 74-81 hesitantly proposes the years following the expedition to Sicily, between 414 and 412. *Contra* see Kyriakidi (2007) 17-8.

¹² A statement attributed by Marcovich (1999) 197 to Dicaearchus on the basis of Plutarch's testimony (*Theseus* 32.5 = 66 Wehrli = 70 Mirhady), which very explicitly at-

page of Diogenes Laertius may be of even greater importance. Both underscore the rural character of the place, and they seem to prepare for the introduction of Isocrates that immediately follows (ὁ δ' οὖν φιλόσοφος καὶ Ἰσοκράτει φίλος ἦν) and for the transition to the information which nearly surprises us: Plato and Isocrates are not only in dialogue, but in dialogue on poets in a rural environment and directly linked by a bond of hospitality.¹³

Plato and Isocrates were and still are mostly considered, in the context of the *literarische Fehden* of the 4th century, as antagonistic teachers of opposing schools.¹⁴ Reluctantly, almost uneasily, the critics – along with Aly,¹⁵ for example, or Wehrli¹⁶ – refer to the introductory section of the final page of the *Phaedrus* (278e), where Isocrates is called ἑταῖρος in the rapid exchange of phrases between the two protagonists, as a source for the assertion of a friendship between the two so strong as to result in guest friendship:¹⁷

ΦΑΙ. Τί δὲ σύ; πῶς ποιήσεις; οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸν σὸν ἑταῖρον δεῖ παρελθεῖν.
ΣΩ. Τίνα τοῦτον;
ΦΑΙ. Ἰσοκράτη τὸν καλόν.

P. What of you? What will you do? For we certainly shouldn't pass over your friend, either.

tributes to Dicearchus the construction of the link between the hero Ἑχέμορ and the name of the Academy in the form Ἑχέδημία. Mirhady (2001) 76-7 is correct in not making Plutarch's passage parallel to that of Diogenes Laertius. On the various forms of name in the tradition, analysis in Dorandi (1988) 576-8. Sources and an extensive bibliography on the reconstruction of the location and on the organization of the school in Erler (2007) 51-5.

¹³ The objective bond is expressed by the infrequent and technical verb ἐπιξενοῦσθαι. Among the few recurrences, ἐπιξενοῦσθαι in the sense of “to receive hospitality” is in Isocrates in the sixth letter, *To the Sons of Jason* (2), where the refusal to stay, διατρίψαι, at the court of Jason is motivated by the fact that to receive hospitality is not suited to old age: τὸ μὴ πρέπειν ἐπιξενοῦσθαι τοῖς τηλικούτοις.

¹⁴ The problem of the relationship between Plato and Isocrates is complex, and critics today tend to reconstruct aspects of this issue less rigidly and unambiguously. Cf. Nicolai (2004) 110-8.

¹⁵ Aly (1954) 1775-6.

¹⁶ Wehrli (1969a) 109.

¹⁷ The final page of the *Phaedrus* is the only place in the dialogues in which the name of Isocrates occurs. There is another citation within the *corpus* in the *Thirteenth Letter* (360c), regarding Helicon of Cyzicus, who is mentioned as a student of both Eudoxus and of Isocrates' students, τῶν Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν. The letter is considered a forgery by Pasquali (1967) 179-85.

S. Who is that?

P. The beautiful Isocrates (trad. Rowe [1986] 131).

But the presence of the *Phaedrus* in the page of Diogenes Laertius is much more extensive. This is evident from the moment in which the background of Plato's story changes radically and focuses on the decisive place, the Academy: Plato διέτριβεν ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ.¹⁸

Through Timon, through the cicadas, the reference to the *Phaedrus* (230c, 259b-d) is easily recognized.¹⁹ Of course, the verse of Eupolis, which has been said to be taken from the *Astrateutoi*, a comedy of which only twelve meager fragments remain (35-47 Kassel-Austin), has no relationship to the *Phaedrus*. According to Storey's conclusions, traditional educational themes, rather than the pacifist ideology which the title seems to presuppose, emerge from the *Astrateutoi*: the image of young men who leave the shady schools and the healthy gymnasia to dedicate themselves to idle intellectual pursuits fits in well among these themes. This image is also evoked by Aristophanes, for example in the *Frogs* (1069-1072), and it is particularly developed in the *Clouds* (1002-1008).²⁰ Here the Academy, which was of course the gymnasium rebuilt and enriched by Cimon, appears as an ideal place in which under the sacred olives run the young men, who are fragrant with flowers and poplars in full bloom, as the plane tree murmurs to the elm (ὁπόταν πλάτανος πτελέα ψιθυρίζει).²¹ Perhaps the description of the shady avenues of the god Ecademus in the *Astrateutoi* of Eupolis played a similar role.

Thanks both to Eupolis' verse, which evokes and identifies the Academy, the ancient gymnasium, as an ideal place, and especially to Timon's

¹⁸ On the technical sense of διέτριβεν, cf. Brisson (1999) 397 n. 2.

¹⁹ Cf. for example Di Marco (1989) 104, Brisson (1999) 397 n. 6, Erler (2007) 52.

²⁰ On Eupolis cf. Storey (2003) 80-1. Especially in the *Clouds*, with reference to Socrates and his students, Aristophanes modulates the wide range of *topoi* related to the mask of the philosopher and the intellectual, which are also present in various fragments of the *archaia* and then are exploited by the authors of the *mese* and the *nea*. A careful reconstruction is offered by Imperio (1998) 99-129.

²¹ The words are pronounced by the Kreitton Logos. The olives are those sacred to Athena, from which the oil for the Panathenaic festivals was obtained. They stood in the yard of the local hero Academus, the place which in the 4th century was adorned with trees and sports facilities through the intervention of Cimon, as Plutarch attests in the *Life of Cimon* (13.7). Cf. the splendid evocation of Baltes (1993) 6-8 = Baltes (1999) 249-252.

passage, which transfers the trees and the cicadas of the *Phaedrus* to the Academy, we can affirm that the passage of Diogenes Laertius describing the Academy projects the characteristics of the καλὴ καταγωγή, of the famous, pleasant scenery along the banks of the Ilissus, which is depicted in the initial scenes of the *Phaedrus* (230 b-e): the trees, the plane-tree and the agnus castus, tall and in full bloom, the marvelous shade, τὸ σύσκιον πάγκαλον, the summer breeze that melodiously echoes the chorus of the cicadas, τὸ εὐπνουν ... θερινόν τε καὶ λιγυρόν ὑπηχεῖ τῷ τῶν τεττίγων χορῷ. The landscape remains naturally in the background in the *Phaedrus* and resurfaces repeatedly, for example, in the words of Socrates (258e-259) that introduce the myth of the cicadas (259 b-e).²² But especially in the epilogue, the scenery is closely linked to the presence of Isocrates, who is not only defined as ἑταῖρος (278e), but is also mentioned by name two other times (278e-279b) and becomes the object of a praise that encompasses his entire literary *curriculum*. Indeed, the final section of the dialogue opens with the evocation of the place and its divinity (278b), νῶ καταβάντε ἐς τὸ Νυμφῶν νᾶμά τε καὶ μουσεῖον, and closes with a reference to the climate, made mild by the diminishing summer heat, which hovered over the landscape at the beginning (279b), ἴωμεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ πνίγος ἡπιώτερον γέγονεν. In the apostrophe to Lysias, Homer, and Solon and the prayer to Pan, the section embeds generous praise for Isocrates' entire literary production in the form of a full and accurate prophecy in three phases (279a-b): today superior to Lysias, Isocrates will soon be first among the orators of any time, and he will ultimately be driven by a ὁρμὴ θειότερα to greater works, ἐπὶ μείζω, since something of philosophy is by nature inherent to him, φύσει γάρ, ὦ φίλε, ἔνεστί τις φιλοσοφία τῇ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διανοία.²³

For now, we can say that the *Phaedrus*, or rather, the narrative framework of the *Phaedrus* as a whole, is the work that sheds light on the testimony of Diogenes Laertius concerning Praxiphanes' διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν. Both the initial part – with its search of trees and shade, the song of the cicadas, in short, the depiction of a paradigmatic rural setting far from the city – and the final part, which recalls that place and

²² Analysis of the *Szenerie* in Erler (2007) 217-8. The descriptive elements may be considered among the factors that give unity to the dialogue “on a variety of non-thematic levels,” as Werner (2007) 133 asserts.

²³ For an interpretation of the passage, contrary to the thesis, largely supported in the past, of a forceful polemic by Plato against Isocrates, cf. Tulli (1990) 403-22.

projects the judgement on Isocrates onto it, are significant. The description of the gardens of the Academy, an ideal place for the complete realization of the ancient paideutic paradigm in the comic tradition, a place so similar to and actually approaching the delightful scenery of the Ilissus in Timon, evokes the figure of Isocrates: καὶ Ἰσοκράτει φίλος ἦν.

Who makes this connection? Who works on the *Phaedrus*? Although we are aware of the “paratassi espositiva” of Diogenes Laertius, who, though “lettore non insensibile né privo di gusto,” moves in a manner of “libera sequenza di frasi e di notizie,”²⁴ we are compelled to respond with the name of Praxiphanes. In the description of the delightful place that serves as a backdrop for the διατριβή between Plato and Isocrates, ἐν ἀγρῷ, perhaps Praxiphanes remembered Eupolis, who evokes the pleasant scenery of the Academy, and perhaps he recalled Timon, who already explicitly relies on the *Phaedrus*.²⁵

In the appeal to the passages of Eupolis and Timon that would give substance to that almost surprising reference, ἐν ἀγρῷ, and to that hospitality extended to Isocrates at the seat of the Academy, which is described as supremely pleasant in the tradition of comedy or, at least, of parody, we can detect a trace of Praxiphanes’ adherence to the method of reconstruction and investigation that belonged to the Peripatos. It is the method expressed in brief by Chamaeleon (in Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 1.21e-f=41 Wehrli=44 Martano) in the programmatic affirmation, in the appendix to two quotations of Aristophanes: παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἢ περὶ τῶν τραγικῶν ἀποκεῖται πίστις, «it is in the comedians that one finds reliable data on the tragedians». In Eupolis and in Timon, following this method, Praxiphanes has found the proof, the concrete incitement to imagine the Academy, transformed into a rural setting with features similar to those of the pleasant landscape of the *Phaedrus*, as a setting for a meeting between Isocrates and Plato, for

²⁴ Gigante (1987) XXX e LXIV. Cf. Meijer (1992) 3569-73.

²⁵ The chronology of Timon nearly coincides with that of Praxiphanes or is slightly earlier. Cf. Clayman (2009) 15-21. But the *Silloi*, which essentially constituted a recognition of Greek thought up to the time of the author, immediately appeared as an “extraordinarily rich mine of bio-doxographic material” and the portraits drawn by Timon attracted the curiosity and the interest of scholars. Cf. Di Marco (1989) 53-6. Lefkowitz (1981) 127 rightly suggests that, in addition to what Plato himself said about Isocrates, Praxiphanes had access to the rich characterization that the comedy gave of Plato. Cf. Delattre (2008) 62-70. On Plato as a prime target of 4th century comedy cf. Imperio (1998) 124-129.

a διατριβή that had as its protagonist Isocrates, the “absent” protagonist of the *Phaedrus*. It may be plausible to think that, if the framework of the *Phaedrus* remains in the background, and if Plato takes the place of Socrates, Praxiphanes may have reserved for Isocrates the role played by Phaedrus.

2. The characters: Plato and Isocrates

If the foregoing considerations can give a more concrete aspect to the setting and to the strong, positive presence of Isocrates in the διατριβή περὶ ποιητῶν, it remains to consider why Praxiphanes would have chosen Plato and Isocrates to be singled out as protagonists of a διατριβή περὶ ποιητῶν, a work of which we know neither form nor content, but which certainly centered on an interest in poets. In other words, on the basis of what data did Praxiphanes legitimately join Plato and Isocrates in an interest in poets?

For Plato, the answer is not difficult. A long series of studies has demonstrated with a wealth of details the essential and complex role played in the dialogues not only by the investigation of the works of the poets, but also, in close harmony, the vigilant and passionate fruition of literary production.²⁶ The presence of the poets overruns the dialogues and takes the shape of a diffuse mass of references. From Tyrtaeus, Simonides, Aristophanes and Euripides, and especially from Pindar and Homer, quotations come one after another, consistent with the period and nature of the dialogue but varying in relation to the different personalities evoked, particularly in the more layered interweaving, sometimes casual or allusive, with the words of Socrates.²⁷

In Isocrates, the comparison with the poets is similar in its constant presence in the background of the discourses, but different in its extent and its form. As a model of the prose and of the new genre, the epideictic discourse, which he attempts to create, Isocrates steadily maintains in the background of the discourses the poetic tradition with her formal characteristics, her peculiar contents and, not least, her effectiveness, her great capacity to impact the public. Clear proof of this is offered by the frequent recurrence in the discourses, and particularly in the programmatic passages, not only of ποίημα, ποίησις, ποιητής, but also of ποιεῖν in the technical sense, for the composition of epideictic

²⁶ Erler (2007) 486-497, with helpful reference to the vast bibliography.

²⁷ Detailed analysis of the passages in Giuliano (2005) 253-338.

discourses, and finally of ποιητικός in relation both to the teaching of rhetoric and to the style of the discourses.²⁸ In the proem of the *Evagoras* (8-11) the comparison between poetry and prose, drawn in the form of a strict parallelism, is the explicit manifesto of the foundation of a new form of eulogy in prose, the heir of the praise in verse.²⁹ Of course, Isocrates does not overwhelm with the mass of references that, in Plato, bring the literary tradition to life in the foreground. But Isocrates refers several times to Homer, for example in the opening of the programmatic discourse *Against the Sophists* (2), as unsurpassed paradigm of σοφία, and in the *Panegyricus* (159), as paradigm of παιδεία for hatred of the barbarians. In the *To Nicocles*, Hesiod, Theognis, and Phocylides are teachers of life and of art (43-44), while Homer and the tragic poets are constant landmarks for the ψυχαγωγία of the listeners (48-49). In the *Antidosis* (166), Isocrates establishes a close connection, on the plane of the consent received, between his speeches in praise of the city and the praises of Pindar, who, merely for having called Athens the bulwark of Greece, ἔρρισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος (*Dith.* 76 Maehler), received privileges and rewards.

Homer also appears in the last part of the *Helen* (65). But here, immediately before the reference to Homer, Isocrates devotes space to Stesichorus (64), protagonist of the famous story in which he regains his sight after composing the *Palinode*. As is well known, it is a story on which Plato dwells in the *Phaedrus*, with fewer details than Isocrates, but with a valuable quotation (243 a-b = Stesich. 192 Davies). It seems like a dialogue at a distance, for which critics have long tried unsuccessfully to re-weave the lost plot, conjecturing purposes and priorities.³⁰ Finally, Homer's presence suffuses the *Panathenaicus* (18, 33 and 263).³¹ But here, in a large part of the proem (16-34), a truly central problem is at stake: the role that poetry should have in the παιδεία. Isocrates describes with a wealth of detail (18-19 and 33) the technique of recitation and exegesis of texts practiced by the sophists who met in the Lyceum (18 and 33), ἐν τῷ Λυκείῳ. He speaks of it as of a διατριβή (19) that is received with great favor by those present, a debate with many speakers into which he himself would want to enter, expressing his opinion on

²⁸ The most exhaustive account is still in Wersdörfer (1940) 117-123.

²⁹ Nicolai (2004) 88-90. Cf. also Classen (2010) 54-55.

³⁰ On the connections between the two texts cf. Zajonz (2002) 283-286.

³¹ Wehrli (1969a) 109 limits himself to quoting a short expression from the proem (33-44) relating to the reconstruction of the title Περί ποιητῶν.

education and on poets, περὶ τῆς παιδείας καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν.³² Now, however, he is compelled to postpone this treatment in deference to the rules of formal expediency, to the rules of the καιρός, and he expresses his intention to revisit the subject in a separate work, περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ποιητῶν αὖθις ἐροῦμεν. In reality, this writing was never composed. According to Jaeger's suggestive proposal, it would have had Plato and, naturally, the *Republic* as an example, if not as a model.³³

We may therefore presume that Praxiphanes' choice of Isocrates and Plato as protagonists of a διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν was justified and, better still, determined not only by a general awareness of the role that poetry and poets constantly play for both in the elaboration of a personal literary form, but also, and not secondarily, by the knowledge of the pages in which both express themselves, or manifest the will to express themselves, on the function that poetry and poets have in the παιδεία.

3. The title: Περὶ ποιητῶν or Περὶ ποιημάτων

I hope that the considerations developed up to this point have helped to restore a more concrete profile of Praxiphanes' method in the creation of his διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν, as well as the role and the value of the presence in the διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν of Isocrates, Plato's co-protagonist. But, before concluding, I would like to suggest briefly that these same considerations help to clarify the problem of the existence itself of a title Περὶ ποιητῶν that is to be ascribed to Praxiphanes.

Some scholars have in fact advanced the hypothesis that in the διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν indicated by Diogenes Laertius may be recognized the Περὶ ποιημάτων which, as I stated above, Philodemus attributes to Praxiphanes in the fifth book of the *On Poems* (col. 12. 28-33 Mangoni = 12 Wehrli = **18.2** and **27** Matelli). In a short, cautious note, Susemihl already suggests that the two titles refer to the same work,³⁴ Wilamow-

³² Wilamowitz (1920) 124 suggests uncertainly that Isocrates might refer to Heraclides of Pontus. Conversely, according to Roth (2003) 86-7, with bibliography, among the various teachers who taught at this time in the gymnasium and in the gardens around the temple of Apollo Lykeios, the praxis described by Praxiphanes fits, better than any other teacher, Aristotle, who was fully active in the years of the writing of the *Panathenais* in the location that later became traditional for the school.

³³ Jaeger (1954) 418 n. 15; more explicitly in Jaeger (1944) 319 n. 82. For Roth (2003) 102, Isocrates here expresses the intention to write a work on poets, impossible because of age, only to give proof of his undiminished creative power.

³⁴ Susemihl (1891) 145-6.

itz³⁵ and Aly³⁶ seem to take this line more decisively. Regarding the title handed down by Diogenes Laertius, Rostagni adds the assertion that “se non è falsa lettera, è probabilmente un equivoco”.³⁷ The hypothesis originated from Jensen, who deduced from Philodemus’ text the view expressed by Praxiphanes in the Περὶ ποιημάτων on the crucial role of form, of λέξις, compared with content, with the πράγματα, for the ἀρετή of literary production. Jensen proposes that the Isocrates who is the protagonist of the διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν should be seen as the spokesman of this view.³⁸

Wehrli seems to maintain a more cautious position, since he, however uncertainly, prints the title Περὶ ποιητῶν together with the title Περὶ ποιημάτων. But for the tradition of the coexistence in one work, and therefore in one title, of a biographical interest in poets alongside a more general one in literary production, he refers to the title Περὶ ποιητικῆς καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν, which Diogenes Laertius attributes to Heraclides of Pontus (5. 88 = 166 Wehrli = 1.88 Schütrumpf).³⁹ Similarly, Janko repeatedly inserts Praxiphanes’ work, which is known alternately in his view both as *On Poems* and *On Poets*, within the tradition of introductory works with a dual structure, one part dedicated to the *ars*, another to the *artifex*.⁴⁰ Examples of this tradition would be offered not only by the title of Heraclides of Pontus, but also earlier by the lost dialogue of Aristotle, to which the title Περὶ ποιητῶν is attributed, but as an alternative to or perhaps alongside the title Περὶ ποιητικῆς.⁴¹

Notwithstanding doubts that are expressed by many, we do not, as we have seen, have decisive proof that the διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν of which Plato and Isocrates are the protagonists coincides with the Περὶ ποιημάτων recalled by Philodemus. This lack of proofs is noted

³⁵ Wilamowitz (1920) 106-7.

³⁶ Aly (1954) 1775-6.

³⁷ Rostagni (1926) 465 n. 2 = Rostagni (1955) 288 n. 1. Cf. Podlecki (1969) 114.

³⁸ Jensen (1918) 9 = Jensen (1923/1973) 96-97. According to Mangoni (1993) 219, the opinion of Praxiphanes introduced by Philodemus in col. 12.28-33 is, in reality, not more definable: the text reconstructed by Jensen is not confirmed by the paleographic data, and perhaps only the general interpretation that Jensen proposes is worthy of consideration.

³⁹ Wehrli (1969a) 109.

⁴⁰ From Janko (1991) 58 to Janko (2003) 153. Cf. Wehrli-Wöhrle-Zhmud (2004) 602-603. The tradition would reach to the *De poematis* of Varro, to be identified with the *De poetis* attributed to the same author.

⁴¹ Cf. Janko (1987) 175. A full discussion of the problems related to the title of the work in Laurenti (1987) 237-9.

particularly by Brink, who undoubtedly distinguishes the two works, hypothesizes an acroamatic, esoteric destination for the *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, analogous to that of Aristotle's *Poetics*, and sees in the *Περὶ ποιητῶν* a dialogue with an exoteric destination, analogous to that of Aristotle's dialogue *Περὶ ποιητῶν*.⁴²

But in defense of the existence of an autonomous title *Περὶ ποιημάτων* by Praxiphanes, which is documented only in Philodemus, Brink limits himself to citing the relationship with the same title of the work of Philodemus. Much more solid, and maybe decisive, in my view, is the tradition which supports the title *Περὶ ποιητῶν*, especially, but not only, in the sphere of the Peripatos. Even by the late 5th century, it is in fact possible to cite the *Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν* of Glaucus of Rhegium (1-6 Lanata)⁴³ as well as the *Περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν* of Damastes of Sigeum (1 Lanata).⁴⁴ The moment of synthesis and also the starting point for later developments is, however, undoubtedly the lost dialogue *Περὶ ποιητῶν* of Aristotle (70-77 Rose = 14-22 Gigon), of which different interpretations have been given,⁴⁵ but from which there emerge with certainty both the interest in individual authors (and the events linked to them) and the use of the anecdote as a legitimate instrument of historical reconstruction.⁴⁶ After Aristotle, we know the *Περὶ ποιητῶν* of Hieronymus of Rhodes (41-43 White) in five or more books, organized by genre, that dealt with both the lives (41, cf. 43, 28, 33-4 White) and the works (42, cf. 44-6, 50-2, 61 White). In the *Περὶ ποιητῶν* of Phainias of Eresus (22-33 Wehrli), in at least two books, the biographical interest was probably united with a peculiar attention to the problems of chronology.⁴⁷ Neither should we forget that, on the basis of a careful analysis of the fragments, the *Περὶ ποιητῶν* of Lobo of Argos has recently been attributed to the

⁴² Brink (1946) 23 n. 2.

⁴³ From the fragments, however meager, the interest in the individual personality and the relative chronology and a constant search for the *πρῶτος εὕρετής* emerge. Analysis by Zhmud (2006) 49.

⁴⁴ Also for Damastes of Sigeum, Zhmud (2006) 49 n. 20 indicates an interest in *εὐρήματα* and problems of chronology.

⁴⁵ After Laurenti (1987) 55-88 and 211-300, cf. Janko (1987) 55-65 and 175-95, as well as Janko (1991) 50-61. A new edition, ten testimonia and over 100 fragments in Janko (2010) 317-539.

⁴⁶ Arrighetti (1994) 218-29.

⁴⁷ Mosshammer (1977) 106-110.

environment and the method of the Peripatos (1-8 Garulli = 8-14 and 16 Crönert).⁴⁸ Finally it is perhaps not to overlook the news preserved from the *Vita* of Nicander (61 Westermann = 33 Crugnola), according to which Dionysius of Phaselis was also the autor of a *Περὶ ποιητῶν*.⁴⁹

In response to the questions posed at the beginning, we are able to advance some hypotheses in conclusion. On the formal level, the examination of Diogenes Laertius suggests that we see an influence of Praxiphanes' *Περὶ ποιητῶν* in the entire passage that has as its background the presence of the Academy, beginning from the quotations of Eupolis and Timon, both the proof for and the origin of the rural setting, according to the method of the Peripatos. Regarding the content, the presence of Isocrates leads us to believe that the substance of the dialogue went beyond the limits of a personal polemic by Praxiphanes against Plato's opinion on literary production to develop reflections on the biography of poets without excluding problems of literary theory, as the pages of Isocrates himself indicated. This was also in accordance with the method of the Peripatos. Finally, against the background of a rich tradition which has its fulcrum in Aristotle and precise parallels in other authors from the Peripatos, we must consider with greater confidence the existence of a title *Περὶ ποιητῶν* for a work that is independent of the *Περὶ ποιημάτων*.

Works cited

- Aly, W. 1954. "Praxiphanes," *RE* 22. 2: 1769-84.
 Armstrong, D. 1995. "Philodemus, *On Poems* Book 5," in *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* ed. D. Obbink (Oxford: University Press): 255-69.

⁴⁸ Garulli (2004) 49-51.

⁴⁹ According to the *Vita*, Dionysius told that Nicander was a priest of Apollo of Clarus, having inherited the priesthood from his ancestors. But, the autor of the *Vita* of Nicander continues, Nicander himself says at the end of the *Theriaca* that he was "bred by the snowy town of Clarus" and Clarus is exactly a place sacred to Apollo. It is difficult here to avoid the impression of biographical data constructed in conformity with the method of the Peripatos. But, despite its relatively frequent presence, for exemple in the scholia to Pindar or in P.Oxy 2368, for Dionysius of Phaselis it is not easy to reconstruct a profile that has any firm foundation. Cf. Montanari (1997) 631-2.

- Arrighetti, G. 1987. *Poeti, eruditi e biografi. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura* (Pisa: Giardini).
- . 1994. “Riflessione sulla letteratura e biografia presso i Greci,” in *La philologie grecque à l’époque hellénistique et romaine* ed. F. Montanari (Vandoeuvres - Genève: Fondation Hardt): 211-49.
- . 2007. “Anekdotē und Biographie. Μάλιστα τὸ μικρὸν φυλάττειν,” in *Die Griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit* ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 79-100.
- Baltes, M. 1993 = 1999. “Plato’s School, the Academy,” *Hermathena* 155: 5-26 = Baltes, M. 1999, *Διανοήματα. Kleine Schriften zu Platon und zum Platonismus* ed. A. Hüffmeier, M.-L. Lakmann, M. Vorwerk (Stuttgart - Leipzig: Teubner): 249-274.
- Brink, K.O. 1946. “Callimachus and Aristotle: An Inquiry into Callimachus’ Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην,” *Classical Quarterly* 40: 11-26.
- Brisson, L. 1992. “Diogène Laërce, ‘Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres’, Livre III: Structure et contenu,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II, 36. 5 (Berlin: de Gruyter): 3619-760.
- . 1999. *Livre III*, in *Diogène Laërce. Vies et Doctrines des philosophes illustres* ed. M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (Paris: Le Livre de Poche).
- Classen, C.J. 2010. *Herrscher, Bürger und Erzieher. Beobachtungen zu den Reden des Isokrates* (Hildesheim - Zürich - New York: Olms).
- Clayman, D. L. 2009. *Timon of Phlius. Pyrrhonism into Poetry* (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Corradi, M. 2007. *Praxiphanes*, on-line in «LGGA».
- Delattre, C. 2008. “Une poétique de la rosserie: des anthologies antiques aux *Silloi* de Timon,” *Revue de Philologie* 82: 47-82.
- Di Marco, M. 1989. *Timone di Fliunte. Silli* (Roma: Ateneo).
- Dorandi, T. 1988. “Four Notes on the Academy,” *Classical Quarterly* n.S. 38: 576-8.
- . 2009. *Laertiana. Capitoli sulla tradizione manoscritta e sulla storia del testo delle Vite dei filosofi di Diogene Laerzio* (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter).
- Dörrie, H. 1972. “Praxiphanes,” *Der Kleine Pauly* 4: 1123-4.
- Erler, M. 2007. *Platon*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie beg. von F. Ueberweg. Die Philosophie der Antike*, II 2, ed. H. Flashar (Basel: Schwabe).
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. 2007. “Biography and the Aristotelian Peripatos,” in *Die Griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 45-78.

- Garulli, V. 2004. *Il Περὶ ποιητῶν di Lobone di Argo* (Bologna: Pàtron).
- Gigante, M. 1987³. *Diogene Laerzio. Vite dei filosofi* (Roma - Bari: Laterza).
- Giuliano, F.M. 2005. *Platone e la poesia. Teoria della composizione e prassi della ricezione* (Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag).
- Imperio, O. 1998. *La figura dell'intellettuale nella commedia greca*, in *Tessere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti*, ed. A.M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastromarco, M. Pellegrino, P. Totaro (Bari: Adriatica): 43-130.
- Jaeger, W. 1954³. *Paideia. Die Formung des griechischen Menschen* (Berlin- Leipzig: de Gruyter) = Jaeger, W. 1944. *Paideia. The Ideals of Greek Culture* (Oxford: University Press).
- Janko, R. 1987. *Aristotle. Poetics with Tractatus Coislinianus, Reconstruction of Poetics II and the Fragments of the On Poets* (Indianapolis: Hackett).
- . 1991. "Philodemus' *On Poems* and Aristotle's *On Poets*," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 21: 5-64.
- . 2003². *Philodemus. On Poems. Book One* (Oxford: University Press).
- . 2011. *Philodemus. On Poems. Book 3-4, with the fragments of Aristotle On Poets* (Oxford: University Press).
- Jensen, C. 1918=1923. "Neoptolemos und Horaz," *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-hist. Classe* 14 = Jensen, C. 1923. *Philodemos. Über die Gedichte. Fünftes Buch* (Berlin: Weidmann): 93-127.
- Kyriakidi, N. 2007. *Aristophanes und Eupolis. Zur Geschichte einer dichterischen Rivalität* (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter).
- Laurenti, R. 1987. *Aristotele. I frammenti dei dialoghi*, I (Napoli: Lofredo).
- Lefkowitz, M.R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Long, H.S. 1964. *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, I (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Mangoni, C. 1993. *Filodemo. Il quinto libro della Poetica* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Marcovich, M. 1999. *Diogenes Laertius. Vitae philosophorum* I (Stuttgart - Leipzig: Teubner).
- Matelli, E. 2012. *Praxiphanes of Mitylenes (called 'of Rhodes'). The Sources, Text and Translation*, in this volume.

- Meijer, J. 1992. "Diogenes Laertius and the Transmission of Greek philosophy," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 36. 5 (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 3556-3662.
- Mirhady, D.C. 2001. "Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text and Translation," in *Dicaearchus of Messana*. Text, Translation and Discussion, ed. W.W. Fortenbaugh, E. Schütrumpf (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- Montanari, F. 1997. "Dionysios aus Phaselis," *DNP* 3: 631-2.
- . 2012. "The Peripatos on Literature: Interpretation, Use and Abuse," in this volume.
- Mosshammer, A.A. 1977, "Phainias of Eresos and Chronology," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 10: 105-132.
- Nicolai, R. 2004. *Studi su Isocrate. La comunicazione letteraria nel IV secolo AC e i nuovi generi della prosa* (Roma: Quasar).
- Pasquali, G. 1967². *Le Lettere di Platone* (Firenze: Sansoni).
- Podlecki, A.G. "The Peripatetics as Literary Critics," *Phoenix* 23: 114-37.
- Preller, L. 1842=1864. "De Praxiphane Peripatetico inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobili disputatio," in *Index Scholarum in Universitate Dorpatensi* (Tartu: Schünmann): 3-26 = Preller, L. 1864. *Ausgewählte Aufsätze aus dem Gebiete der classischen Alterthums-wissenschaft*, ed. R. Köhler (Berlin: Weidmann): 94-112.
- Ramelli, I. 2005. "Note al testo," in *Diogene Laerzio. Vite e dottrine dei più celebri filosofi*, ed. G. Reale (Milano: Bompiani).
- Rostagni, A. 1926-1927. "Il dialogo aristotelico Περὶ ποιητῶν," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 54: 433-70, 55: 145-73 = Rostagni, A 1955. *Scritti minori, I Aesthetica* (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus): 255-326.
- Roth, P. 2003. *Der Panathenaikos des Isokrates* (München - Leipzig: Saur).
- Rowe, C.J. 1986. *Plato. Phaedrus* (Warminster: Aris and Phillips).
- Schorn, S. 2012. "Chamaeleon: Biography and Literature *Peri tou deina*," in this volume.
- Sollenberger, M.G. 1992. "The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' 'Vitae Philosophorum' Book V," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II 36. 6 (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 3793-879.
- . 2000. "Diogenes Laertius' Life of Demetrius of Phalerum," in *Demetrius of Phalerum. Text, Translation and Discussion*, ed.

- W.W. Fortenbaugh, E. Schütrumpf (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers): 311-29.
- Storey, I.C. 2003. *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford: University Press).
- . 2011. *Fragments of old Comedy, II. Diopeithes to Pherecrates* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press).
- Susemihl, F. 1891. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Swift Riginos, A. 1976. *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning The Life and Writings of Plato* (Leiden: Brill).
- Tulli, M. 1990. "Sul rapporto di Platone con Isocrate: profezia e lode di un lungo impegno letterario," *Athenaeum* 78: 403-22.
- Wehrli, F. 1969^{2a}. *Die Schule des Aristoteles, IX Phainias von Eresos, Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes* (Basel - Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- . 1969^{2b}. *Die Schule des Aristoteles, X Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler. Rückblick: der Peripatos in vorchristlicher Zeit. Register* (Basel - Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- Wehrli, F., Wöhrle, G., Zhmud, L. 2004². *Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit*, in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie beg. von F. Ueberweg. Die Philosophie der Antike*, III ed. H. Flashar (Basel: Schwabe).
- Werner, D. 2007. *Plato's Phaedrus and the Problem of Unity*, in *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy XXXII* ed. D. Sedley (Oxford: University Press): 91-137.
- Wersdörfer, H. 1940. *Die φιλοσοφία des Isokrates im Spiegel ihrer Terminologie* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz).
- Wilamowitz Moellendorff, U. von. 1920². *Platon, II Beilagen und Textkritik* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Zajonz, S. 2002. *Isokrates' Enkomion auf Helena. Ein Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Zhmud, L. 2006. *The Origin of the History of Science in Classical Antiquity* (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter).

Thucydides *adoxos* and Praxiphanes

Michele Corradi

Marcellinus' *Life of Thucydides* offers us evidence concerning the *Περὶ ἱστορίας* of Praxiphanes which has long attracted the attention of critics. In one section that betrays, through a stylistic peculiarity, if not an outright dependence then at least an influence of the scholiographic production, a list of homonyms is presented: the son of Olorus; the demagogue Thucydides, son of Melesias; a Thucydides of Pharsalus; the son of Menon mentioned by Polemon in his books on the Acropolis (*FHG* 3.117 F 5); and, finally, a poet Thucydides of the deme Acherdous who was referred to by Androtion in his *Atthis* (*FGrHist* 324 F 57) as the son of Ariston (28):¹

¹ This section of Marcellinus (28-30) is analyzed by Arrighetti (1987) 204-28 who carefully considers the relationship with *POxy.* 1611, fr. 1, col. V 101-20, and with the *Scholia* on the *Wasps* (947b-c) emphasizing the analogy of the list of homonyms that is presented in the three texts to the discussion of characters with the name Aristomides offered by the *Περὶ Δημοσθένους* of Didymus (9, 43-10, 11). It appears unlikely that the list of homonyms, all contemporaries, derives from Demetrius of Magnesia as Schöll (1878) 435-6 supposed. Rather, it dates back to the *κωμωδοῦμενοι* of Ammonius according to Raubitschek (1960). Cf. Jacoby (1923-58) III b, Suppl. II, 388-9. Piccirilli (1985) 110-2 offers a full discussion of the figures considered by Marcellinus. The correct form of the name of the poet Thucydides' father is, according to Davies (1971) 53-4, Ἀριστίων, which is documented epigraphically. The introductory formula μὴ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ ὅτι recalls the typical language of the scholia. Cf. Bux (1930) 1455-8.

Μὴ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ ὅτι ἐγένοντο Θουκυδίδαι πολλοί, οὗτός τε ὁ Ὀλόρου παῖς, καὶ δεύτερος δημαγωγός, Μελησίου, ὃς καὶ Περικλεῖ διεπολιτεύσατο· τρίτος δὲ γένει Φαρσάλιος, οὗ μέμνηται Πολέμων ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἀκροπόλεως, φάσκων αὐτὸν εἶναι πατρὸς Μένωνος· τέταρτος ἄλλος Θουκυδίδης ποιητής, τὸν δῆμον Ἀχερδούσιος, οὗ μέμνηται Ἀνδροτίων ἐν τῇ Ἀτθίδι, λέγων εἶναι υἱὸν Ἀρίστωνος.

Immediately after the list of homonyms, Marcellinus returns abruptly to the subject of the βίος, Thucydides the historian. It would indeed be difficult to attribute to the unknown poet – as Jacoby, among others, maintains – what follows, particularly his extraordinary posthumous good fortune.² Marcellinus notes that, according to the *Περὶ ἱστορίας* of Praxiphanes (21), Thucydides would have been a contemporary of the comic poet Plato (*PCG* T 4), the tragedian Agathon (*TrGF* 39 T 5), the epic poet Niceratus (*SH* 564), Choerilus (T 5 Bernabé), and Melanippides (7 A 2 Del Grande). And Thucydides, according to Praxiphanes' evidence, was largely unknown when Archelaus was alive, but would later be greatly admired (29):

συνεχρόνισε δ', ὥς φησι Πραξιφάνης ἐν τῷ περὶ ἱστορίας, Πλάτῳ τῷ κωμικῷ, Ἀγάθῳ τῷ τραγικῷ, Νικηράτῳ ἐποποιῷ καὶ Χοιρίλῳ καὶ Μελανιππίδῃ. καὶ ἐπεὶ μὲν ἔζη Ἀρχέλαος, ἄδοξος ἦν ὥς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, ὥς <ὁ> αὐτὸς Πραξιφάνης δηλοῖ, ὕστερον δὲ δαιμονίως ἐθαυμάσθη.

The text has created more than a few problems for critics, particularly because of the presence of the name of Archelaus, which in all probability refers to the king of Macedonia. There is, in fact, no parallel source which clearly establishes any connection between King Archelaus and Thucydides. For this reason, it has been proposed that Ἀρχέλαος be either expunged from the text or transposed. But, as Momigliano has pointed out, even if the elimination of a word renders the sentence more innocent and reasonable, “innocence is no sign of authenticity:

More generally, according to Luzzatto (1993), the work of Marcellinus was per se an ample *excerptum* from the initial parts of a Late Ancient scholastic commentary on Thucydides of the kind called σχόλια (ἀπὸ φωνῆς).

² Tuplin (1993-4) 181-2 responds to Jacoby's hypothesis (1923-58) III b, Suppl. I, 163-4 and III b, Suppl. II, 145-6 with arguments which, in my opinion, are decisive. Thucydides the poet should probably be identified with the Thucydides of Acherdous ταμίας of Athens in 424/423 (*IG* I³ 302, 28). Cf. Harding (1994) 183.

Archelaus must remain in Praxiphanes' fragment even if we no longer understand his presence."³

Despite Momigliano's understandable resignation, we shall attempt once again to question Archelaus' presence in the fragment. As I stated earlier, the tradition knows of no other clear evidence for the link between Thucydides and the king of Macedonia, which Praxiphanes somehow seems to assume. A faint trace of evidence can perhaps be discerned in an epigram attributed to Thucydides in honor of Euripides, who died at the court of Archelaus (*AP* 7.45).⁴

As is well known, the data available to ancient scholars for the reconstruction of biographical events and the personalities of important cultural figures such as poets and philosophers were in any case not very numerous. Information about an author was often obtained by expanding ingeniously, though in many cases imaginatively, on information contained in the author's own works according to the so-called *metodo di Cameleonte*.⁵

Thucydides speaks little of himself in the *History*. In Book I, he claims to have been a direct witness of some of the events which he is about to narrate (21). In Book II, he recalls being struck by the plague (48). In Book IV, he offers the name of his father, Olorus (104.4), and relates with a wealth of detail his own service as a general in 424/423 (104-107). This generalship involved specific tasks in Thrace, where Thucydides had some property and took advantage of a gold mining contract, and so enjoyed a certain influence. While as general was un-

³ Momigliano (1993²) 66-7. Visconti (1808) 121-2 n. 5 suggests the transposition of the name of Archelaus after Melanippides, in the dative and preceded by a καί: Praxiphanes would not have referred to the king of Macedonia but to the philosopher, a pupil of Anaxagoras and a teacher of Socrates. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1877) 353-5 takes into consideration the hypothesis that Ἀρχέλαος was a marginal gloss mistakenly inserted into text. Moreover it is not very plausible to make Ἀρχέλαος the subject of ἄδοξος ἦν. Cf. Piccirilli (1985) 117. Ἔως is a conjecture of Matelli (21) instead of the manuscripts' ἐπεί.

⁴ Canfora (1996) XXXVII identifies in the attribution of the epigram to Thucydides, confirmed by Athenaeus (187d), a trace of a tradition which connected the historian with Archelaus' court. The *Life of Euripides* (II p. 3, 4-10 Schwartz) propose an alternative attribution to Timotheus, an intellectual connected anyway to the Macedonian court. On this problem, cf. also Arrighetti (1964) 150.

⁵ On the origins and the development of this method, central to the literary and biographical research of the school of Aristotle, the contribution of Arrighetti (2006) 285-301 is fundamental. Cf. Schorn (2004) 41-3. Corradi (2007) offers an updated bibliography. Arrighetti (2008) presents an assessment of the most recent contributions.

able to arrive in time to avoid the defection of Amphipolis, he managed to save the port of Eion.⁶

In the so-called second proem of the fifth book (we don't consider here Luciano Canfora's suggestive theory, which attributes the passage to Xenophon, the first editor of Thucydides), he claims that he spent twenty years in exile far from Athens after the events of Amphipolis (26).⁷

Around this core of information provided by Thucydides himself, there developed in ancient scholarship, to quote the title of a fundamental contribution of Wilamowitz, a sort of *Thukydideslegende*.⁸ While a plausible kinship with Miltiades and Cimon emerges from Plutarch's testimony (*Cim.* 4.2); another more doubtful kinship with the Peisistratids is reconstructed by Hermippus (*FGrHist* 1026 F 87a-b Bollansée). According to Marcellinus (22), ancient scholars theorized that Thucydides was a disciple of Anaxagoras or of Antiphon. They also proposed several different places where Thucydides may have lived while in exile: Aegina, the Thracian Skapte Hyle, where the historian would have written his works in the shade of a plane tree, or, according to a report of Timaeus (*FGrHist* 566 F 135), Italy. Various versions of Thucydides' return to his homeland circulated in antiquity. According to Aristotle (125 Gigon), after receiving amnesty following the defeat of the Athenians in Sicily, he was able to hear the extraordinary defense

⁶ Rood (2006) attributes the autobiographical elements to a specific rhetorical strategy of Thucydides, chosen to establish his own "narrative authority." For the problem of the correct spelling of the name of Thucydides' father, cf. Canfora (2006) 3-8. A close analysis of the autobiographical section of Book 4 is in Hornblower (1991-2008) 3.44-53. Ellis (1978) perceives an apologetic perspective, particularly in the emphasis given to the strategic importance of Eion. Mazzarino (1966) 1.253-7 judges Thucydides' report to be a lie. In any case, Thucydides is not silent about the grave consequences of the loss of Amphipolis for Athenian public opinion (4.108). Cf. Canfora (1996) XLIV.

⁷ Cf. especially Canfora (1996) XLIV-LIX. In support of his own hypothesis, the scholar in any case cannot avoid emending the text or adopting a *varia lectio* so as to eliminate the reference to the strategy ἐς Ἀμφίπολιν. Cf. Nicolai (2006) 704-6. A thorough defense of the paternity of Thucydides in this section is in Lapini (1991), who, identifying in the twenty-year duration of the exile the principle difficulty, arrives at the hypothesis of the expunction of ἔτη εἴκοσι. Canfora (2006) 16-7 now considers a non-consecutive twenty year period. The presence of an unclear tradition per se concerning Thucydides' return to Athens before 404 is not enough, however, according to Hornblower (1991-2008) 3.52, "to justify emending... or rejecting... the present passage of Thucydides."

⁸ Wilamowitz-Möllerndorff (1877).

speech of Antiphon. Didymus (3, pp. 323-4 Schmidt), however, attests that he perished violently on his return journey, perhaps having been called out of exile by an *ad personam* decree from a certain Enobius, as recounted by Pausanias (1.23.9). According to yet another tradition, Thucydides died in exile, and a cenotaph was erected for him at Athens only later. But Polemon (*FHG* 3.117 F 4) asserts that he was buried next to Herodotus among the Cimonian sepulchral monuments. This wealth of conflicting traditions may indicate a lack of information, which ancient scholars filled in a largely autoschediastic manner.⁹

The hypothesis of a relationship between Thucydides and Archelaus may have originated from the pages of the historian's own work. In the second book, within the narrative of events concerning the expedition of King Sitalces of the Odrysians against Macedonia, Thucydides asserts that the inhabitants of Lower Macedonia, before the advancing Thracian army, took refuge in the few fortifications that the territory offered. Only later would King Archelaus have built the fortifications which existed at the time of Thucydides, opened the highways, and

⁹ As Dover (1975) 140-1 has highlighted well, in the realm of ancient biography, when confronted by a copious array of information that includes contrasting alternatives, it is incorrect to neglect the hypothesis that "all of them may be false." According to Piccirilli's reliable reconstruction (1985) 64-6 and 93-4, Hegesipyle, the mother of Thucydides, was the daughter of Thucydides, son of Melesias, and of a sister of Cimon, as well as the bride of the cousin Olorus, born to another sister of Cimon and an Athenian of the deme Halimous. The names of the parents recall those of Olorus I, king of the Thracians, and of his daughter Hegesipyle, the wife of Cimon's father, Miltiades. Regarding the kinship link with the Peisistratids, the partisan tone of the episode about Harmodius and Aristogeiton (6.54-9) is presented by Hermippus (*FGrHist* 1026 F 87a-b Bollansée) only perhaps as ancillary evidence. Hermippus probably gives an account of a first marriage of Miltiades to a daughter of Hippias. Cf. Bollansée (1999) 572-80. As is illustrated by Fairweather's study (1974) 262-3, the reconstruction, even in the absence of objective data, of the disciple-teacher relationships between important figures of the past is a topic for ancient biography. Regarding the place of exile, Aegina and perhaps also Italy seem to pertain rather to Thucydides of Melesias, while Marcellinus (25), the *De Thucydide* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (41), and Plutarch's *De exilio* (605c) all converge on Skapte Hyle. On Thucydides' possible places of residence during his exile, cf. Schepens (1980) 168-87. The reference to the plane tree probably recalls Plato's *Phaedrus* (230b-c). The amnesty following the defeat in Sicily is recorded by Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 137) and by Demetrius of Phalerum (92 SOD): it would exclude the Peisistratids. Through a thorough analysis of the text of Pausanias (1.23.9), Lapini (1991) 36-41 offers arguments in support of the historicity of the decree of Enobius. On the funeral monuments of Thucydides recorded by the ancient scholars, cf. Canfora (2006) 6-11.

organized the military in a better way than all the other eight kings who had reigned before him (100.2):

ἦν δὲ οὐ πολλά, ἀλλὰ ὕστερον Ἀρχέλαος ὁ Περδίκκου υἱὸς βασιλεὺς γενόμενος τὰ νῦν ὄντα ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὠκοδόμησε καὶ ὁδοὺς εὐθείας ἔτεμε καὶ τὰλλα διεκόσμησε τὰ [τε] κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἵπποις καὶ ὅπλοις καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ παρασκευῇ κρείσσοις ἢ ξυμπάντες οἱ ἄλλοι βασιλῆς ὀκτὼ οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενόμενοι.

Such marked praise could not have failed to attract the attention of those who were interested in literary criticism, like Praxiphanes, and were able to search within the text of Thucydides for elements from which to reconstruct his character. Thucydides' detailed knowledge of Macedonia could certainly suggest a visit by the historian to the region, perhaps even in connection with the parallel tradition that makes Skapte Hyle, the Thracian locale not far from Macedonia, the place of his exile.

But even more, the words of praise for the sovereign could suggest a close relationship between Thucydides and Archelaus, who may have hosted the historian during his years of exile.¹⁰

In a similar style is Thucydides' praise for Antiphon (8.68), which is at the foundation of the tradition which establishes the discipleship of Thucydides with Antiphon. Aristotle (125 Gigon) infers, probably from the same passage, that the historian was present at the trial of Antiphon, though this conclusion certainly clashes with what Thucydides says about his own twenty-year exile from Athens in the so-called second proem.¹¹

¹⁰ Praxiphanes has played an important role in the development of ancient literary criticism (9A-C Matelli = 8-10 Wehrli²). Corradi (2009²) offers a summary of his significant contribution. Hornblower (1991-2008) 1.376 supposes that the praise of Archelaus could have been written by Thucydides after the death of the king, which took place in 399 BCE, "because it seems to sum up his achievement almost in the manner of an obituary." However, cf. the prudent observations of Fantasia (2003) 595, who suggests a useful bibliography concerning the activity of the sovereign in the civil and military spheres. On the reconstruction of the Macedonian history in Thucydides, there is a precise picture in Zahrnt (2006) 590-7. The extremely positive judgment that Thucydides offers on Archelaus certainly contrasts with Plato's *Gorgias*, in which the sovereign is for Polus the paradigm of the ἄδικος εὐδαίμων (470d-1d). In any case, as Dalfen (2004) 275-6 stresses, the reconstruction of Archelaus' biography proposed by Polus, which seems to interweave noticeable literary motives – Herodotus (3.120-6), perhaps the same *Archelaus* of Euripides – is not received without reserve by Socrates (471a, 525d). On the relationship between the biography of Archelaus and the homonymous drama by Euripides, cf. Jouan-Van Looy (1998) 288-9 n. 25.

¹¹ The praise offered in the eighth book and the information about the discipleship

If on the basis of some characteristic elements of Peripatetic literary research, we can therefore explain in some fashion the presence of Archelaus in our fragment, it is not so easy to understand fully what connection might have existed between Archelaus and Thucydides' fame, or what relationship may be detected between this information and the synchronism with the five poets identified by Praxiphanes.

We will begin with this second problem. For at least two of the five contemporaries of Thucydides named by Praxiphanes significant connections are noted with the Macedonian court, and with Archelaus in particular. The tragic poet Agathon (*TrGF* 39 T 7b, 11, 22a-b, 25) would have gone to the court of Archelaus around 407, where he may have died around 401.¹² The epic poet Choerilus, according to Ister (*FGrHist* 334 F 61 = T 4 Bernabé), also stayed at the court of Archelaus, where he received four minas per day to spend on delicacies and where, according to the *Suda* (χ 595, IV p. 834, 24-33 Adler = T 1 Bernabé), he ended his days. Regarding the dithyrambic poet Melanippides, the *Suda* (μ 454-5, III, p. 350, 15-21 Adler = 18 T1 Sutton = 7 A 1 Del Grande) testifies to his presence in Macedonia not under Archelaus but under Perdiccas, at whose court he would die. Plutarch, in any case, associates Melanippides with Archelaus in *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* (1095d). However, there is no evidence that attests to a connection with Macedonia for either the comic poet Plato or Niceratus.¹³

are clearly connected in Marcellinus (22). Certainly, as Tulli (2003) 98-9 emphasizes, such a discipleship was already noted by Plato in the *Menexenus* if Thucydides is the intellectual of inferior *paideia*, the pupil of Antiphon and Lamprus, to whom Socrates alludes (235e-6a). The news of Thucydides' presence at the trial of Antiphon, that Cicero's *Brutus* records quoting Aristotle (47 = 125 Gigon), has particular importance for the reconstruction of Canfora (1996) XLIV and LIV. But, according to Hornblower (1991-2008) 3.50-1, it does not derive from Aristotle but from Cicero's "own over-interpretation of Th. 8.67."

¹² In the *Scholia* to the *Frogs* (85 = *TrGF* 39 T 7b) the sequence εἰς μακάρων εὐωχίαν from Aristophanes' text is explained as a reference to the ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις διατριβή of Agathon, in good company, μετὰ ἄλλων πολλῶν, at the court of Archelaus in Macedonia until his death, μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς. As the scholia emphasizes, the sequence was, however, also intended as a reference to the poet's abandonment of mortal life, but, at the time of the performance of the *Frogs*, Agathon was most likely still alive. Cf. Mastromarco and Totaro (2006) 570 n. 17.

¹³ On the figures cited by Marcellinus and their relationship with the court of Macedonia, cf. the accurate analysis of Piccirilli (1985) 114-6. The voice of the *Suda* (χ 595, IV p. 834, 24-33 Adler = T 1 Bernabé) offers a contradictory chronology for Choerilus of Samos: see on this Radici Colace (1979) 11-3, who places his birth between 468 and

Hirzel hypothesized from this data that, behind the synchronism, there lurks a scene of the dialogue *Περὶ ἱστορίας* that depicts the presence at the court of Archelaus of Thucydides and the five poets mentioned by Marcellinus. From the existence of this dialogue of Praxiphanes, Marcellinus' source would have deduced that Thucydides and the other poets had been contemporaries.¹⁴

According to Hirzel, the theme of the dialogue would naturally have been the status of the historiographic genre, of which Thucydides would have been the spokesman, analyzed in relationship to poetry, in particular to the genres represented by the other poets: tragedy, represented by Agathon; comedy, by Plato Comicus; epic poetry, by Choerilus and Niceratus; and, finally, dithyrambic poetry, represented by Melanippides. The background for this dialogue would have been the [ninth chapter](#) of Aristotle's *Poetics*, in which history and poetry are distinguished on the basis of the polarity between *καθόλου* and *καθ' ἑκάστων*. Hirzel's hypothesis, which is accepted by Wehrli among others, is certainly suggestive. It may be worthwhile to consider it again here.¹⁵

465 and his death between 404 and 399. Regarding Melanippides, Tuplin (1993-4) 187 attempts to reconcile the information from the *Suda* (μ 454-5, III, p. 350, 15-21 Adler = 18 T1 Sutton = 7 A 1 Del Grande) with that from *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* (1095d), hypothesizing that the dithyrambic poet's stay at the Macedonian court began under Perdiccas and extended into the reign of Archelaus.

¹⁴ Hirzel (1878) and Hirzel (1895) 1.311. On the tendency of ancient biography to establish, even forcedly, relationships of synchronicity among important figures of literary history so as to permit their meeting, Fairweather (1974) 261-2 offers important reflections. For example, already in the *Certamen* (54-5) the opinion of those who consider Homer and Hesiod contemporaries is linked to the *agon* between the two poets. Cf., for the role of the *Certamen* in the development of ancient biography, Arrighetti (2007) 87-90. As Bollansée (1999a) 29-30 emphasizes, the synchronism among the Seven Sages, "tremendously important for early Greek chronology," is clearly linked to the opportunity "to bring the members of the *collegium* into contact with one another and, thus, to exhibit their wisdom in full splendour." For the tangle of problems underlying the formation of ancient chronologies, in particular from the use of sources of a different nature, including literary sources, cf. Mosshammer (1979) 84-127. The emblematic case reported by Athenaeus (599c-d), founded on the Peripatetic Chameleon (28), bases the tradition of an anachronistic, amorous relationship between Anacreon and Sappho on an incorrect interpretation of their production. On this issue, Martano (in this volume, notes to 28) discusses an extensive bibliography. The passage of Marcellinus represents, according to Cameron (1995) 196, "the earliest synchronized list of contemporary writers in a biography."

¹⁵ Wehrli (1969²) 112. There is a useful bibliography on the issue in Piccirilli (1985) 112-4. As Tuplin (1993-4) 183-4 demonstrates, the use of *φησί* and *δηλοῖ* by Marcel-

First, as Hirzel himself pointed out, the form of a dialogue appears more than once in Praxiphanes' work. As proof of the existence of a friendship between Isocrates and Plato, Diogenes Laertius (3.8) quotes Praxiphanes (**22**) as a witness to a discussion *περὶ ποιητῶν* involving Plato and Isocrates, guests of the philosopher. From this, one can easily infer the existence of a dialogue on poets – identified by some with the *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, which is mentioned in Philodemus' homonymous work (*Poëm.* V, col. 12, 23-33 Mangoni = **27**) – in which Praxiphanes placed Isocrates and Plato. It has been proposed that the *Περὶ φιλίας* of Praxiphanes, against which Carneiscus directed a polemic in *Philistas*, also had a dialogical form (*PHerc.* 1027, coll. 13-6, 18 and fr. 95 Capasso = **20a, c-e**).¹⁶ In any case, dialogue as a suitable form for developing historical-literary research is certainly well attested in the Peripatos, at least from the *Περὶ ποιητῶν* of Aristotle until Satyrus' *Life of Euripides*.¹⁷

Another element, never before considered by critics, is the fact that Marcellinus mentions exactly seven characters: Plato Comicus, Agathon, Niceratus, Choerilus, Melanippides, Archelaus, and Thucy-

linus (29) does not contrast with the hypothesis of the dialogue. Preller (1842) 107 had already formulated the bold hypothesis that identifies the *Περὶ ἱστορίας* with the *διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν* recalled by Diogenes Laertius (3.8 = **22**). According to Luschnat (1970) 1152-3, the work of Praxiphanes may also have focused on the use of antilogy in Thucydides. Porciani (2001) 48-51 hypothesizes that the *Περὶ ἱστορίας* of Praxiphanes may also be the source of the entry *Ἑλλάνικος* of the *Suda* (ε 739, p. 238, 18-24 Adler). According to Fuhrer (1996), Callimachus would have responded to the work of Praxiphanes with the *Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην* (**11**). Cf. however the careful observations of Arrighetti (2006) 375-6 n. 3. That *ἱστορία* in the title of Praxiphanes' work should have the meaning of "history" and not simply of "inquiry" seems to me certain just from the reference to Thucydides. Similarly, the reference to Herodotus ensures that same meaning in the [ninth chapter](#) of Aristotle's *Poetics* (1451b2-3). See about this Zhmud (2002) 289-92 and Mejer (2002) 245-6.

¹⁶ The contribution of Maddalena Vallozza in this volume is dedicated to the *διατριβὴ περὶ ποιητῶν*. On the possible identification of this work with the *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, last supported by Janko (1991) 58, cf. also Corradi (2009²) and Matelli in this volume. The hypothesis formulated by Crönert (1906) 72, that the *σύγγραμμα* of Praxiphanes cited by Carneiscus (**20e** 7-9) had the form of a dialogue, rests on the *εἰσάγει* of col. 18, 7: there is, however, a lack of further evidence that would allow the hypothesis to be accepted. Cf. Capasso (1988) 252-4.

¹⁷ Cf. Schorn (2004) 35-6. On the development of dialogue in Aristotle and in his school, also important are the pages of Hirzel (1895) 1.272-351. Laurenti (2003) offers a more recent fine-tuning. Cf. now also Zanatta (2008) 15-35.

dides.¹⁸ It is well known that seven characters offer a discourse in Plato's *Symposium* (Phaedrus, Pausanias, Eryximachus, Aristophanes, Agathon, Socrates, and Alcibiades). As Krischer, among others, highlights, the *Symposium* adopts the traditional device of the banquet of Seven Sages. Even a discussion of literary argument, such as the status of historiographic production, could fit in well with the context of a symposium: consider the discussion about tragedy and comedy among Agathon, Aristophanes and Socrates, to which Plato alludes at the very end of the *Symposium* (223c-d). We cannot exclude the possibility that Praxiphanes also used the model of the symposium of Seven Sages for the Περὶ ἱστορίας.¹⁹

As we said before, Hirzel identified the theoretical foundation of Praxiphanes' dialogue in the [ninth chapter](#) of Aristotle's *Poetics* (1451a36-b32).²⁰ Let us return to the famous passage and try to imagine how Praxiphanes could have inserted the characters of the Περὶ ἱστορίας into the picture sketched by Aristotle.

In *Poetics* 9, Aristotle asserts that the task of the poet is not to recount things that have happened, τὰ γινόμενα, but things that are possible, οἷα ἂν γένοιτο καὶ τὰ δυνατά, according to plausibility or necessity, κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον. The historian is not distinguished from the

¹⁸ As Tuplin (1993-4) 188-9 has recently shown, the nature of the list of contemporaries, which is cited by Marcellinus, testifies itself in favor of the hypothesis of the dialogue. The absence of two of Archelaus' famous guests, Euripides and Timotheus, allows us to place the dialogue between the death of Euripides (407/406) and the arrival of Timotheus. Therefore, Praxiphanes "was not simply offering a full list of Archelaus' literary visitors" but "a subset of visitors to Macedonia that to which Thucydides is being connected or contrasted."

¹⁹ Cf. Krischer (1984). The relationship of Plato's *Symposium* to the tradition of the Banquet of the Seven Sages was already emphasized by Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1920²) 1.356-9. As is clear from Snell's study (1971⁴) 115-8, such a tradition was known at least since the 5th century. Cf. Bollansée (1999a) 29-30. There are important reflections in Clay (2000) 137-9 relating to the discussion on tragedy and comedy which concludes Plato's *Symposium* (223c-d). Cf. now Erler (2007) 198-9. The same figure of Archelaus in the Περὶ ἱστορίας could well have embodied that of the learned and refined host of prominent intellectuals, anticipating in some way the Periander of Plutarch's *Banquet of the Seven Sages*. On the qualities that this character adopts in the dialogue, but which Plutarch excludes from the group of sages, see Lo Cascio (1997) 52-4. Aelian (VH 13.4 = *TrGF* 39 T 22a) and the Plutarchean *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* (177a = *TrGF* 39 T 22b) attest to the presence of Agathon in the context of a symposium at Archelaus' court in the company of Euripides.

²⁰ Hirzel (1878) 48.

poet in that one writes in prose and the other in verse: Herodotus' work would remain ἱστορία even if it were in verse. The difference between poetry and history depends on the more philosophical and serious character of the first, φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον: poetry in fact deals principally with universals, τὰ καθόλου, while history revolves around particulars, τὰ καθ' ἑκάστον. Καθόλου means the sorts of things that it fits a certain type of person to say or do, τῷ ποίῳ τὰ ποῖα ἅττα συμβαίνει, according to plausibility or necessity. To this generalized structure, poetry does nothing but add names. In contrast, what Alcibiades did or suffered is καθ' ἑκάστον. The reference to historiographic production is evident, and it may be an allusion to Thucydides himself, who dedicated significant space to Alcibiades in his work (1451a36-b11).

The same polarity between the particular and the universal distinguishes comedy from iambic poetry. While comic poets construct a plot based on plausible characters, on which they then impose imaginary names, the iambic poets compose directly about a particular character. Tragedy, on the other hand, takes its names from tradition and, as part of the same tradition, ensures that events which are the subject of tragedies are plausible. But even in the case of tragedy, tradition imposes the names of only the principal characters, while the names of minor characters are invented. Agathon's *Antheus* (*TrGF* 39 F 2a) is based entirely on invented characters and events; nonetheless, the work was a success. Therefore, it is not necessary to cling at any cost to the tales that have been handed down. On the basis of these considerations, says Aristotle, the poet is a poet principally because he creates μῦθοι and not because he writes in verse. The fundamental element of the poetic activity is in fact the μίμησις of πράξεις (1451b11-29). Aristotle finally returns to the central problem of poetry's relationship to history, emphasizing that a poet is still a poet even if he represents events which have actually taken place. Nothing prevents the inclusion, among real events, of some events which meet the criteria of plausibility and show those traits of universality which poetic production, to be what it is, cannot do without (1451b29-32).²¹

²¹ Halliwell (2002) 193-206, to whom I also refer for the rendering of συμβαίνει (1451b8), offers perceptive remarks on the nature of the καθόλου that is characteristic of poetry: the comprehension of a mimetic work implies a reference to the general conceptual structures that emerge from man's experience of the world and provide an ordered foundation to his way of understanding it. It would, however, be incorrect to refer simultaneously to the concept of the typical or to see in the universal of poetry an inquiry into the immutable aspects of human nature. According to Donini (2008)

According to Hirzel's hypothesis, it is possible, on the basis of Aristotle's sketch, to hypothesize the function of the characters in Praxiphanes' dialogue. Thucydides, to whom Aristotle seems to allude with the reference to Alcibiades (1451b11), would undoubtedly have played the role of the spokesman for historiography. Agathon also appears in the chapter of the *Poetics*, in which he is remembered for the *Antheus* (1451b19-23 = *TrGF* 39 F 2a), a tragedy in which the poet renounced the myths which had been handed down, a tragedy thus totally separated from the reality of the *γεγνόμενα* and completely projected on the level of *καθόλου*. It is possible to conjecture that in the *Περὶ ἱστορίας* Agathon may have explained, in light of Aristotle's considerations, the reasons for a tragedy of this kind.²² As for Choerilus, who is noted for the production of an epic with a historical subject (he is remembered for the composition of a poem about the Greco-Persian war), we can surmise that he may have presented a defense of historical epics. Such a defense can perhaps be imagined by drawing on Aristotle's magisterial statement, which underlines the possibility that the *γεγνόμενα* show traits of universality that are capable of rendering them fitting objects for poetic production (1451b29-32).

It is more difficult to grasp the role of the epic poet Niceratus, about whom we have very little information at our disposal. From Plutarch's *Lysander* (18.6), we learn that Niceratus (*SH* 565) competed with Antimachus (T 2 Matthews) and gained the victory at a feast in honor of

XXXIII-LVI, the universal results from a selection: the poet chooses only the *γεγνόμενα* that are capable of rendering the chain of causes and effects more transparent, ignoring those contingent aspects which make that chain less intelligible. But all the plots share an even more general significance, which is consistent with the result of Aristotle's ethical reflection, a second-degree universal according to which every human action is aimed at the conquest or the defense of happiness. In the centrality which Aristotle gives to the *μῦθος* in the *Poetics*, Arrighetti (2006) 356-8 sees the traditional conception which assigned to the poet the function of educator. On the different role that the *ὀνόματα* take on for Aristotle within comic and tragic plots in view of the *καθόλου*, cf. Dupont-Roc and Lallot (1980) 222-6. Gastaldi (1972) 222-8, in light of Aristotle's epistemological theories, studies some key terms on which the relationship between poetry and history is based in *Poetics* 9. Cf. now Kloss (2003). Behind the name of Alcibiades, De Sainte Croix (1975) 27-9 sees a clear reference to Thucydides.

²² If the *Ἀνθεῖ* accepted by Kassel (1965) 16 is correct, it must be considered that the title of Agathon's tragedy did not refer to any of the Antheuses known to the tradition. Cf. Donini (2008) 65 n. 113. Lévêque (1955) 105-13 discusses an extensive bibliography on the issue. Agathon's attempt to create a tragedy of pure invention that renounces the traditional stories stands alone. Cf. on this Burian (1997) 183-6 and 207-8.

Lysander. Perhaps Praxiphanes used the figure of Niceratus to insert a laudatory production into Aristotle's framework.²³ Likewise, Melanippides, the famous representative of the dithyramb, may have served as a means for Praxiphanes to propose an analysis of this literary genre from the perspective of the [ninth chapter](#) of the *Poetics*. After all, Praxiphanes' particular interest in literary genres, even rare ones, is attested by Hesychius (δ 1398, s.v. διατροχάδες = **31**).²⁴ The choice of Plato Comicus may have been useful to illustrate the relationship between comedy and iamb, which Aristotle explained in the *Poetics* in light of the polarity between καθόλου and καθ' ἑκάστον. The presence of Plato Comicus in the dialogue may also perhaps be connected with later accounts which, as is clear for example from the *Scholia* to Dionysius Thrax (*GG*. I 3, pp. 19, 23-20, 6 Hilgard = *PCG* T 16) and from the *Prolegomena de comoedia* (IV p. 12, 16-7; XIb p. 40, 33-8; XVIIIa pp. 71, 37-72, 43 Koster), portray Plato as the representative of a more

²³ On the epic production of the historical subject of Choerilus of Samos, the contribution of Huxley (1969) is important. Cf. also Angeli Bernardini (2004). Radici Colace (1979) XIII-XXI offers a useful picture of the literary motif of the Persian Wars with an extensive bibliography. According to Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983) 278, the Niceratus of Heracleia mentioned by Plutarch corresponds to the Niceratus who is recalled by Praxiphanes; however, he is probably not to be identified with the homonymous rhapsode whom Aristotle, citing Thrasymachus, mentions in the *Rhetoric* (1413a7-10 = 85 A 5 DK). Cf. however Macé (2009) 152-3 n. 5. As Landucci Gattinoni (1997) 234-9 confirms, Plutarch's source is probably Duris (*FGrHist* 76 F 71). Piccirilli (1997) 263 argues for the historicity of the Λυσάνδρεια of Samos. In view of Aristotle, as Halliwell (2002) 199 emphasizes, the poet has the opportunity to organize historical material within the unified structure of a coherent plot. According to Fritz (1958) 280-2, the fact that Aristotle (1451b6-7) maintains that poetry concerns μάλλον τὰ καθόλου as compared to history implies that to a certain extent the historian also deals with the universal, even if to a lesser measure than the poet. Cf. however Arrighetti (2006) 254 n. 1.

²⁴ Certainly in the few surviving fragments of Melanippides, a poet celebrated for his bold innovations in the field of music – on this, see Barker (1984-9) 1.93-4 – no clear interest in history appears. Cf. Sutton (1989) 43-7. In a dialogue Περὶ ἱστορίας one would have expected instead the presence of another famous representative of the dithyrambic genre with a connection to Archelaus, the Timotheus of Miletus who had tried his hand at a famous historical theme in the *Persians*. For Timotheus' connections with the Macedonian court and for a detailed exposition of the characteristics of the dithyrambic genre, see Hordern (2002) 4-6 and 17-25. As Matelli *ad loc.* underscores, Praxiphanes used διατροχάδες, probably a neologism, to indicate a poetic genre that was still nameless or was in need of a more precise name. It is not clear, however, if the term indicated a metric or compositional characteristic. Cf. on this also Corradi (2009²).

advanced phase of Attic comedy, able to soften the iambic element and render it less pronounced. From the titles and fragments of Plato Comicus' works, it is after all possible to distinguish the comedies with more markedly political content from those, perhaps later, comedies that are disengaged from politics. One can therefore trace in Plato's production an arc similar to that of Aristophanes. Maybe Praxiphanes chose Plato to exemplify comedy's definitive abandonment of the iambic element and, therefore, the complete affirmation of the *καθόλου* over the *καθ' ἑκάστον*.²⁵ One could therefore formulate the bold hypothesis that, following in Aristotle's footsteps, the individual figures in Praxiphanes' dialogue proposed an examination of the various literary genres, which were represented based on each genre's greater or lesser connection with the *καθόλου*. Perhaps Praxiphanes succeeded in structuring this examination in a format that built to a climax, similar to that which some interpreters have discerned in the succession of discourses in Plato's *Symposium*.²⁶

Beyond this hypothesis, it remains to be considered what comprehensive judgment about historiographic production, and about Thucydides in particular, emerges from Praxiphanes' dialogue. Wehrli supposed that Praxiphanes shared Aristotle's judgment of *ἱστορία*, and that he therefore offered a substantially negative valuation of Thucydides. In support of this hypothesis, he noted that Praxiphanes presented Thucydides as *ἄδοξος*.²⁷

But perhaps, upon careful consideration of the text of Marcellinus, we may interpret the information in a completely opposite way. As we have seen from Marcellinus, Thucydides was at the most *ἄδοξος* while Archelaus was alive – Marcellinus cites Praxiphanes to support this information – and was only later exceptionally admired, *ὑστερον δὲ δαιμονίως ἐθαυμάσθη*. It is not necessary, however, to attribute to

²⁵ For the ambiguous position of Plato Comicus in the scholarly tradition, see Nesselrath (1990) 34-7, who justly recalls the different points of view on which the various ancient classifications depend. For a useful starting point on the issue, cf. Mastromarco (1992), especially 342-3. Rosen (1995) offers a description of the recognizable avant-garde tendencies in the production of Plato. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1128a22-5), Aristotle distinguishes the new comedies from the old by the passage from a comedy founded on *αἰσχρολογία* to one founded on *ὑπόνοια*. For the evolution of the comic genre according to Aristotle, see the detailed analysis of Heath (1989). On Aristotle's reasons for considering comedy more universal than tragedy, cf. Lucas (1968) 121.

²⁶ For Plato's *Symposium*, I also refer in this case to Krischer's study (1984).

²⁷ Wehrli (1969²) 112.

Praxiphanes only the first part of this information, that is, Thucydides' lack of fame. It is in fact possible that Marcellinus or his source also relied on Praxiphanes for the second part, in which the extraordinary success that smiled on the historian in a period following the death of Archelaus is evident.²⁸

We shall thus find ourselves, as Graziano Arrighetti emphasized, before a *topos* well-attested in ancient biographic production, particularly that of the Peripatetic mold: a lack of recognition of an intellectual's greatness on the part of his contemporaries.²⁹ An interesting parallel may be seen in Satyrus' *Life of Euripides*. After a section dedicated to the misadventures suffered by the misunderstood Euripides in Athens, Satyrus underlines how Euripides had spent his old age in Macedonia, highly honored at Archelaus' court. This was to the detriment of the viewpoint of the Athenians, who realized the greatness of the poet after the Macedonians and the Greeks of Sicily: τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν Ἀθήνησιν [οὐ]δὲ λέγειν ἄξιον, οἳ γε ποιητὴν τηλικούτον Μακεδόνων καὶ Σικελιωτῶν ὕστερον ᾔσθοντο (fr. 39 col. XIX 2-11 Schorn). As evidence of this, two anecdotes are cited. One is related to the period of the expedition in Sicily. Many Athenians once taken prisoner saved themselves thanks to their knowledge of Euripides' verses, which were famous among the Greeks of Sicily, who greatly admired Euripides: οὕτως ἡ Σικελία ἀπ[ασ]α τὸν Εὐ[ριπίδη]ν ἀπε[θαύμαζ]εν (fr. 39 col. XIX 30-34 Schorn). The other is related to Archelaus himself who, in response to those who criticized the poet for his bad breath, recalled the sweetness of the songs and verses that flowed from that same mouth: ποῖον δὲ στόμα τοιούτ[ο] γέγονεν, ἢ γένοιτ' ἂν ἥδιον, δι' οὗ γε τοιαῦτα μέλη τε καὶ ἔπη διαπορεύεται (fr. 39 col. XX 7-15 Schorn). "Words worthy of a person who had valued the poet in an exceptional way," comments one of the interlocutors in Satyrus' dialogue, ὅμοιος οὗτος ... δαιμονίως ἐντετι[μ]ακότι πρὸ[ς] τὸν ποιητὴν (fr. 39 col. XX 15-21 Schorn). Satyrus contrasts the Athenians' negative opinion of Euripides with that of the Macedonians, in particular of Archelaus, and of the Sicilian Greeks, who were capable of comprehending the greatness of the poet before the Athenians did.³⁰

²⁸ Tuplin (1993-4) 183 does not exclude this possibility.

²⁹ Arrighetti (1987) 213-4.

³⁰ The anecdote about the Athenian prisoners is also reported in Plutarch's *Nicias* (29.2-4), again reflecting the favor that Euripides enjoyed far from Athens. Arrighetti (1964) 143 hypothesizes that the source of Satyrus and Plutarch may have been Philo-

In fact, as Stefan Schorn emphasizes, the reason for the Athenians' lack of understanding of the value of important intellectuals is a topic for the Peripatos. In the *Apology of Socrates*, Demetrius of Phaleron speaks of a φθόνος of the Athenians toward Diogenes of Apollonia that almost cost the philosopher his life (107 SOD), and of the difficult relationships that Heraclitus (106 SOD) and Democritus (108 SOD) had with Athens. Heraclides of Pontus sees in the unjust accusations against important intellectuals a consistent attitude of the Athenians. He proposes the cases of Homer, Tyrtaeus and Socrates, upon whom the Athenians, after a sudden repentance, would bestow great honors after their deaths (169-70 Wehrli² = 97-8 Schütrumpf).³¹

In contrast, a positive valuation by Archelaus both clearly falls within the philo-Macedonian attitude of the Peripatos and can respond to the traditional pattern of the “*polloi*-Antithese.” The host of important intellectuals including Euripides and, as it appears from Praxiphanes' fragment, Thucydides, Archelaus was able to appreciate their greatness. The negative evaluation of Euripides offered by the Athenians is contradicted by the correct judgment of Archelaus. Moreover, Aristotle, borrowing a saying of Antiphon to Agathon, forcefully contrasts the opinion of the σπουδαῖος to that of the πολλοί in the *Eudemian Ethics* (1232b4-9 = *TrGF* 39 T 6): it is appropriate

chorus, who would, however, perhaps have drawn on authors particularly interested in Sicily such as Timaeus and Philistus. On the potential pan-Hellenic character of Euripides' production and on his rapid success outside Athens, especially in Sicily and Magna Graecia, cf. Easterling (1994) and Allan (2001). The anecdote about Euripides' bad breath was already known to Aristotle, who cites it, with some variation from Satyrus' account, in the *Politics* (1311b30-4). The philosopher may be at least the indirect source for Satyrus: the iambic structure of the sequence μέλη τε καὶ ἔπη does not in fact necessarily refer to a comic source, according to Schorn (2004) 332-3, who hypothesizes the presence of a “Anekdotensammlung in Jamben als Zwischenquelle.” On the tradition regarding Euripides' stay in Macedonia, cf. Ippolito (1999) 89-93. On the structure of the *Life of Euripides* and the methods of biographical reconstruction followed by Satyrus, there is now a useful starting point in Regali (2008), who offers an extensive bibliography.

³¹ Schorn (2004) 58-9. Montanari (2000) places the biographical interests of Demetrius of Phaleron within the sphere of his ample scholarly activity. For the centrality of the anecdotal component in the reception of the dialogues of Heraclides of Pontus, cf. Fox (2009) 60-4. On the role of Aristotle himself in the genesis of traditions relating to judicial misadventures suffered in Athens by more than one intellectual, I refer to Corradi (2007a) 291-2.

for the μεγαλόψυχος to take into account only the opinion of the σπουδαῖος.³²

The same pattern followed by Satyrus for Euripides may also have been at the base of the Περὶ ἱστορίας of Praxiphanes. Thucydides, devoid of fame and respect among the Athenians, found in Archelaus a sovereign capable of understanding his greatness. This greatness would be universally recognized, even by Athens, only later on, when the Macedonian sovereign was already dead.

I do not believe that this interpretation invalidates Hirzel's hypothesis, which we have taken up here. Thucydides' return to fortune after the death of Archelaus does not necessarily preclude the possibility that Praxiphanes' work had a dialogical form. It is possible to hypothesize that the reference to events that took place after the unfolding of the debate was contained within the frame of the dialogue, if not in a fully developed proem. The presence of proems in the dialogues of Aristotle and the Peripatetics is, after all, well attested. An interesting parallel may however be seen in the proem of Plato's *Theaetetus* (142a-3b). Here, Euclid and Terpsion weave a praise for Theaetetus, who had been mortally wounded while fighting in Corinth, and recall what Socrates had prophesied about him when he was still a boy. Socrates, who had met him shortly before he was condemned to death, had remained struck by his φύσις. He had disclosed to Euclid, to whom he had revealed the content of the conversation, that, if Theaetetus had arrived at the age of maturity, he would have become a famous man, ἐλλόγιμος. The dialogue that follows is, as is well known, the account of that conversation.³³

³² The most thorough treatment of the "polloi-Antithese" is found in Voigtländer (1980), specifically, 551-2. Canfora (1996) XXIII-XXV places the passage from the *Eudemian Ethics* (1232b4-9) within the larger picture of Aristotle's more general reflection on the trial of Antiphon and on the events of the last 5th century. For the centrality of the theme of μεγαλοψυχία in the Peripatetic biographical production, particularly in Satyrus, cf. Schorn (2004) 59-63. On the relationships of Aristotle and of the Peripatos with Macedonia, Scholz (1998) 153-79 and 185-92 offers a detailed investigation. Porciani (2001) 51 sees traces of a favorable attitude towards Macedonia also in Praxiphanes' Περὶ ἱστορίας.

³³ On the presence of proems in the dialogues of Aristotle and of his school, cf. Laurenti (1987) 57-60. An especially complex game of levels of narrative time must have characterized, in particular, the structure of the Περὶ τῆς ἄπνου of Heraclides (78-89 Wehrli²; cf. 17 no. 24c Schütrumpf), on which see Gottschalk (1980) 13-22. Cf. also Fox (2009) 51-60. Heitsch (1988) 19-23 sees in the proem of *Theaetetus* the perspec-

The reason for the ἀδοξία of Thucydides may have been deduced by Praxiphanes from what Thucydides himself reveals about his twenty-year exile that was due to the loss of Amphipolis. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that Praxiphanes used external information. A scholion, unfortunately irremediably corrupted, to Aristophanes' *Wasps*, which seeks to identify the Thucydides mentioned by the comic poet, offers a piece of information concerning Thucydides' lack of fame, perhaps in some way to make a connection to Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 121). This information is derived from the poet's silence and justified on the basis of the condemnation of Thucydides to exile following the loss of Amphipolis (947c):

τοῦτο δὲ Φιλόχορος μὲν ἱστορεῖ †, ὃς οὐδὲ πάντῃ γνώριμος ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς κωμικοῖς, διὰ τὸ ἐπ' ὀλίγον στρατ<ηγίας> ἀξιωθέντα μετὰ Κλέωνος ἐπὶ Θράκης φυγῇ καταψηφισθῆναι.

Moreover, the embarrassing lack of clear references to Thucydides in Plato and Aristotle must not have escaped Praxiphanes.³⁴

More generally, however, I think it is to some degree possible to turn once again to the so-called *metodo di Cameleonte* in order to explain Praxiphanes' application to Thucydides of the pattern which Satyrus

tive of a *post mortem* homage to Theaetetus. Friedländer (1964-75³) 3.130-3 illustrates the importance of the proem for the work as a whole. On the existence of an alternative proem reported by the anonymous commentator of *PBerol.* 9782 (col. III 28-49 Bastianini-Sedley) see especially Carlini (1994). Cf. also Erler (2007) 232.

³⁴ The text of the scholion is carefully discussed by Jacoby (1923-58) III b, Suppl. I, 482-4 and III b, Suppl. II, 388-91. It is likely that the words ὃς οὐδὲ πάντῃ refer to the historian Thucydides, whose name would have fallen into the gap: the scholiast, addressing the problem of the identity of the Thucydides mentioned by Aristophanes, would have noticed that the historian never appeared in comic production. Arrighetti (1987) 214 relates the information contained in the scholion with Praxiphanes' Περὶ ἱστορίας. In his view, however, the data about Thucydides' poor fortune, which were originally present in the biographical and historical-literary tradition where they were used to attest to his greatness, would have passed into the hypomnematic literature; only at this stage would it have been provided with evidence, such as the silence of the comic poets, to be used for the purely exegetical purpose of the identification of the figure in the text which is commented on. Despite the lack, or near lack, of direct references, Thucydides is, according to Canfora (1996) XXVIII-XXIX, an author who is read and pondered deeply by both Aristotle and Plato. Tulli (2003a) 227-9 considers plausible a connection between Plato and the pages of Thucydides in Book 3 of *Laws*.

would follow for Euripides: disregard on the part of the citizens; recognition by a σπουδαῖος; and subsequent rehabilitation.

In a very famous passage, which Tuplin has already connected to Praxiphanes' Περὶ ἱστορίας, Thucydides explains the profound meaning of his own work (1.22.4).³⁵ The absence of a fantastic element certainly renders it less pleasing to its audience. But according to Thucydides, it will be enough if those who want to inquire carefully into the events of the past and the future – which, due to human nature, will be the same or similar to those of the past – will find his work useful. Indeed, his work is not a showpiece for its immediate audience but a possession for all time:

καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται· ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὖθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει. κτῆμά τε ἐς αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν ξύγκειται.³⁶

This passage of Thucydides already contains within itself the possibility of developing the pattern that, according to our reconstruction, Praxiphanes followed. Thucydides' work is not conceived as an immediate success; for this reason the historian was ἄδοξος in Athens. It is enough for Thucydides, however, that he be considered useful by those who will want to inquire with precision into past and future events; Archelaus was, in fact, capable of grasping his usefulness. The work of Thucydides is a κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί: for this reason, later on, Thucydides was greatly admired.

If our analysis in some way hits the mark, Wehrli's conclusion, that Praxiphanes would have formulated in Περὶ ἱστορίας a negative judg-

³⁵ Tuplin (1993-4) 189-91.

³⁶ Hornblower (1991-2008) 1.59-62 offers a detailed comment on this section. As clearly emphasized by Nicolai (1995), who offers a broad outline of the ancient and modern interpretations, the general political perspective of ancient historiography is difficult to reconcile with the interpretation of Gomme (1945) 149, for whom Thucydides' words would have assigned a purely theoretical utility to the inquiry into the past. On this, cf. also Bakker (2006) 116-23. On the predictive character which Thucydides' attributes to inquiry into the past, there are valuable considerations in Pugliese Carratelli (1970). Kallet (2006) highlights the intention to offer a research model for the historians of the future. For the connection which Thucydides wants to establish here with his predecessors, cf. Corcella (2006) 52-5.

ment of the historiographic genre and of Thucydides, appears hasty. If we can really bring to Praxiphanes what Marcellinus offers us in the passage of the βίος of Thucydides that we considered, we should instead conclude that Praxiphanes offered praise for the historian.

But is it possible to reconcile the praise for Thucydides with the perspective delineated by Aristotle in *Poetics* 9, which, following Hirzel, we took as the theoretical basis for Praxiphanes' dialogue? Certainly the final words of the passage from Aristotle that we considered seem to lessen the distance between history and poetry. The possibility is outlined that the γενόμενα can demonstrate those characteristics of universality and plausibility required by poetic production, and the legitimacy of a poem with a historical topic is acknowledged. It is moreover a well established fact that the historiographic production of the Hellenistic age, from Duris onwards, looked to the model of tragedy. Still, it is not my intention to return here to the admittedly suggestive hypothesis, now received with scant favor by critics, which, from Schwartz onwards, saw in the Peripatetic reflection on history, particularly in that of Theophrastus and Praxiphanes, the element of tragic historiography of the Hellenistic age. But at least the biographic production of the Hellenistic age, which draws its lifeblood from the inquiries of the Peripatos, seems to overcome, as Graziano Arrighetti recently showed, the polarity between καθόλου and καθ' ἑκάστων studied by Aristotle, conferring, principally with the instrument of the anecdote, on the individual γενόμενα an exemplary value. And the students of Isocrates, Theopompus and Ephorus, also assigned an exemplary value to historical work.³⁷

³⁷ Cf. Arrighetti (2007) 95-6. For the characteristics of Peripatetic biographical inquiry and for the connections between biography and historiography in the Hellenistic age, see lastly Schepens (2007) and Fortenbaugh (2007). The hypothesis of a tragic historiography inspired by the Peripatetic reflection, especially by the two works Περὶ ἱστορίας by Praxiphanes (21) and Theophrastus (727 no. 8 FHS&G), dates back at least to Schwartz (1897) 560-1. This perspective is forcefully rejected by Walbank (1960). Fritz (1958) 271-9 offers a detailed discussion of the issue. Cf. also Rutherford (2007). For Theophrastus' thoughts on history, there is a useful review in Podlecki (1985). The analysis of Halliwell (2002) 287-91 certainly shows in Duris of Samos (*FGrHist* 76 F 1 and, especially, 76 F 89) a conception of μίμησις that is consistent with Aristotle's reflection: the historian should avoid a too-detailed μίμησις and should represent events in their essentials. On the tendency of the historical production of Ephorus and Theopompus to the exemplar, Pownall (2004) 113-75 reaches significant results. Cf. also Marincola (2007). For the value given to the historic *exempla* in Isocrates, on which I refer to Nicolai (2004) 79-83, see for example *To Nicocles* (35) or *Evagoras* (9-11).

I would like to propose here a possible way – I am aware that this is only a hypothesis – to resolve the apparent contradiction between the praise of Thucydides and the perspective that we tried to make out in the paltry remains of the dialogue. One might think that Praxiphanes, to develop his own thoughts on historiography, went back to places in which Aristotle expressed a less negative opinion about this genre. In particular, several pages from the *Rhetoric* may have drawn Praxiphanes' attention. In the second book Aristotle addresses the arguments common to all types of discourse, among these the παραδείγματα, the examples (1393a26-1394a18). One form of παράδειγμα is the exposition of past events, τὸ λέγειν πράγματα προγενόμενα. The case of παράδειγμα presented by Aristotle concerns a constant in the politics of the Persian Empire. Both Darius and Xerxes subdued Egypt before attacking Greece. Therefore, if the king of Persia tried again to subdue Egypt, the Greeks should try to stop him in order to avoid a subsequent attack on Greece (1393a32-b4). Shortly after (1394a5-8), Aristotle emphasizes the utility, χρησιμώτερα, of historical example for deliberative rhetoric: future events are at least similar to those of the past, ὅμοια γὰρ ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τὰ μέλλοντα τοῖς γεγονόσιν. It is not difficult to see in this excerpt from Aristotle an echo of Thucydides' famous passage that was analyzed above. The usefulness of Thucydides' work also resides in the correspondence between past and future: τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὖθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι. Compared to the *Poetics*, Aristotle reassesses Thucydides' historiographic production in terms of deliberative rhetoric and of politics. In the *Rhetoric* (1360a33-37), he also stresses utility on the political level, particularly the politico-military, of the study of histories of πράξεις.³⁸

³⁸ For the treatment of the historical παραδείγματα in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, I refer here to the analysis of Nicolai (1992) 42-9. Rapp (2002) 2.319 and 732-4 puts forward a timely comment on the passages considered here. For the subordinate role of the παραδείγματα relative to the ἐνθυμήματα in Aristotle's treatment, cf. also Grimaldi (1980-8) 1.57. De Sainte Croix (1975) discusses more than one passage from Aristotle related to the notion of the ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, which is not secondary to the philosopher's reflections on history. The positive judgment which Aristotle expresses in the rhetorical-political sphere should not in any case be detached from his more general attitude of distrust in the epistemological value of historical data which Aristotle inherited from Plato. Cf. Arrighetti (2006) 373-5. A reevaluation of Herodotus and Thucydides, at least on the level of style, was certainly offered by Theophrastus, according to what emerges from the *Orator* of Cicero (12.39 = 697 FHS&G). The passage would not, however,

The knowledge of the past, especially of its constants, of how much the γενόμενα draws on the καθόλου, acquires a dignity of its own in politics. Perhaps, in his Περὶ ἱστορίας, Praxiphanes may have integrated *Poetics* 9 with considerations developed in the *Rhetoric*. He had seen in Thucydides' historiographic work the exemplar, and he had seen features of the καθόλου flash in the γενόμενα of the Peloponnesian War. Perhaps he underlined the value of the knowledge of the past from the perspective of politics. For this reason, he offered a positive judgment on Thucydides. It is not by coincidence that the dialogue takes place in the presence of a political man, the king of Macedonia, the representative of a dynasty destined for an extraordinary future, the first to recognize that greatness of Thucydides, which had gone unnoticed in an Athens started by then towards an inevitable decline.³⁹

Works cited

- Allan, W. 2001. "Euripides in *Megale Hellas*. Some Aspects of the Early Reception of Tragedy," *G&R* (Ser. 2) 48: 67-86.
- Angeli Bernardini, P. 2004. "Etnografia e storia nell'epos di Cherilo di Samo," in *Samo. Storia, letteratura, scienza*, ed. Eleonora Cavallini (Pisa - Roma: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali) 2004: 31-50.
- Arrighetti, G. 1964. "Satiro. *Vita di Euripide*," *SCO* 13: 1-168.
- . 1987. *Poeti, eruditi e biografie. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura* (Pisa: Giardini).
- . 2006. *Poesia, poetiche e storia nella riflessione dei Greci. Studi* (Pisa: Giardini).
- . 2007. "Anekdotē und Biographie. Μάλιστα τὸ μικρὸν φυλάττειν," in *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 79-100.
- . 2008. "Cameleonte peripatetico e gli studi sulla biografia greca," in *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli*, ed P. Arduini *et al.* (Roma: Aracne): 63-9.

be connected to the Περὶ ἱστορίας of Theophrastus, according to Fortenbaugh (2005) 320-3.

³⁹ Mazzarino (1966) 1.514-5 highlights the political perspective in which Praxiphanes, when accentuating the importance of the relationship between Thucydides and Archelaus, framed historiographic work.

- Bakker, E. J. 2006. "Contract and Design: Thucydides' Writing," in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 109-29.
- Barker, A. 1984-9. *Greek Musical Writings*, I-II (Cambridge - New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Bollansée, J. 1999. "Hermippos of Smyrna," in *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Continued. IV, Biography and Antiquarian Literature*, ed. G. Schepens (Leiden - Boston - Köln: Brill).
- . 1999a. *Hermippos of Smyrna and His Biographical Writings. A Reappraisal* (Leuven: Peeters).
- Burian, P. 1997. "Myth Into Mythos: the Shaping of Tragic Plot," in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. P. E. Easterling (Cambridge - New York: Cambridge University Press): 178-208.
- Bux, E. 1930. "Μαρκελλῖνος [n. 49]," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, XIV 2: 1450-87.
- Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton: University Press).
- Canfora, L. 1996. Tucidide. *La guerra del Peloponneso* (Torino: Einaudi-Gallimard).
- . 2006. "Biographical Obscurities and Problems of Composition," in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 3-31.
- Capasso, M. 1988. *Carneisco. Il secondo libro del Filista (PHerc. 1027)* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Carlini, A. 1994. "Il commento anonimo al *Teeteto* e il testo di Platone," in *Storia, poesia e pensiero nel mondo antico. Studi in onore di Marcello Gigante* (Napoli: Bibliopolis): 83-91.
- Clay, D. 2000. *Platonic Questions. Dialogues with the Silent Philosopher* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press).
- Corcella, A. 2006. "The New Genre and Its Boundaries: Poets and Logographers," in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 33-56.
- Corradi, M. 2007. "Chamaeleon," in *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi*, ed. F. Montanari, F. Montana and L. Pagani (www.lgga.unige.it).
- . 2007a. "L'origine della tradizione sul processo di Protagora," in *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 285-301.
- . 2009². "Praxiphanes," in *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi*, ed. F. Montanari, F. Montana and L. Pagani (www.lgga.unige.it).

- Crönert, W. 1906. *Kolotes und Menedemos* (Leipzig: Avenarius).
- Dalfen, J. 2004. Platon. *Gorgias* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families. 600-300 bC* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- De Sainte Croix, G. E. M. 1975. "Aristotle on History and Poetry (*Poetics* 9, 1451a36-b11)," in *The Ancient Historian and His Materials*, ed. B. Levick (Farnborough: Gregg International): 45-58, reprinted in *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*, ed. A. Oksenberg Rorty (Princeton - Chichester 1992: Princeton University Press): 23-32.
- Donini, P. 2008. *Aristotele. Poetica* (Torino: Einaudi).
- Dover, K. 1975. "The Freedom of the Intellectual in Greek Society," *Talanta* 7: 24-54, reprinted in *The Greek and Their Legacy. Collected Papers. 2* (Oxford - New York: Blackwell 1988): 135-58.
- Dupont-Roc, R., Lallot, J. 1980. *Aristote. La Poétique* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil).
- Easterling, P.E. 1994. "Euripides outside Athens: a Speculative Note," *ICS* 19: 73-80.
- Ellis, J. R. 1978. "Thucydides at Amphipolis," *Antichthon* 12: 28-35.
- Erler, M. 2007. "Platon," in *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike, II 2*, ed. H. Flashar (Basel: Schwabe).
- Fairweather, J. 1974. "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers," *AncSoc* 5: 231-75.
- Fantasia, U. 2003. *Tucidide. La guerra del Peloponneso. Libro 2* (Pisa: ETS).
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. 2005. *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary. 8* (Leiden - New York: Brill).
- . 2007. "Biography and the Aristotelian Peripatos," in *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 45-78.
- Fox, M. 2009. "Heraclides of Pontus and the Philosophical Dialogue," in *Heraclides of Pontus. Discussion*, ed. W.W. Fortenbaugh and E. E. Pender (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers): 41-67.
- Friedländer, P. 1964-75³. *Platon. I-III* (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter).
- Fritz, K. von 1958. "Die Bedeutung von Aristoteles für die Geschichtsschreibung," in *Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* (Vandœuvres): 85-145, reprinted in *Schriften zur griechischen und römischen Verfassungsgeschichte und Verfassungstheorie* (Berlin - New York 1976: de Gruyter): 256-301.

- Fuhrer, T. 1996, "Hellenistische Dichtung und Geschichtsschreibung. Zur peripatetischen und kallimacheischen Literaturtheorie," *MH* 53: 116-22.
- Gastaldi, S. 1972. "Poesia e historia nella *Poetica* aristotelica," *RIL* 107: 202-42.
- Gomme, A.W. 1945. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Gottschalk, H.B. 1980. *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford - New York: Oxford University Press).
- Grimaldi, W.M.A. 1980-8. *Aristotle*. Rhetoric. I-II (New York: Fordham University Press).
- Halliwell, S. 2002. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis. Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton: University Press).
- Harding, P. 1994. *Androtion and the Atthis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Heath, M. 1989. "Aristotelian Comedy," *CQ* 39: 344-54.
- Heitsch, E. 1988. *Überlegungen Platons im Theaetet* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Hirzel, R. 1878. "Die Thukydideslegende," *Hermes* 13: 46-9.
- . 1895. *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, I-II (Leipzig: S. Hirzel).
- Hordern, J. H. 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford - New York: Oxford University Press).
- Hornblower, S. 1991-2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, I-III (Oxford - New York: Oxford University Press).
- Huxley, G. 1969. "Choirilos of Samos," *GRBS* 10: 12-29.
- Ippolito, P. 1999. *La vita di Euripide* (Napoli: Giannini).
- Jacoby, F. 1923-58. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 1a-3b (Berlin - Leiden: Brill).
- Janko, R. 1991. "Philodemus' *On Poems* and Aristotle's *On Poets*," *CErc* 21: 5-64.
- Jouan, F., Van Looy, H. 1998. *Euripide*. 8, *Fragments*. 1, *Aigeus-Auto-lykos* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Kallet, L. 2006. "Thucydides' Workshop of History and Utility outside the Text," in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 335-68.
- Kassel, R. 1965. *Aristotelis*. De arte poetica liber (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Kloss, G. 2003. "Möglichkeit und Wahrscheinlichkeit im 9. Kapitel der aristotelischen Poetik," *RM* 146: 160-83.

- Krischer, T. 1984. "Diotima und Alkibiades. Zur Struktur des platonischen Symposion," *GB* 11: 51-65.
- Landucci Gattinoni, F. 1997. *Duride di Samo* (Roma: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider).
- Lapini, V. 1991. "Tucidide rimpatriato," *SIFC* (Ser. 3) 9: 9-51.
- Laurenti, R. 1987. *Aristotele. I frammenti dei dialoghi* (Napoli: Loffredo).
- . 2003. "Aristote de Stagire. Les 'Dialogues'," in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, Supplément, ed. R. Goulet (Paris: CNRS): 379-471.
- Lévêque, P. 1955. *Agathon* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Lloyd-Jones, H., Parsons, P. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berolini - Novi Eboraci: de Gruyter).
- Lo Cascio, F. 1997. *Corpus Plutarchi Moraliū. 26, Il convito dei Sette sapienti* (Napoli: D'Auria).
- Lucas, D.W. 1968. *Aristotle. Poetics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Luschnat, O. 1970. "Thukydides der Historiker," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, Suppl.-Bd. XII: 1085-354.
- Luzzatto, M.J. 1993. "Scholia tardoantichi. Il commentario di Marcelino a Tucidide," *QS* 38: 111-5.
- Macé, A. 2009. "Thrasymaque de Chalcédoine," in *Les Sophistes. 2*, ed. J.-F. Pradeau (Paris: Flammarion): 9-32, 149-66.
- Marincola, J. 2007. "Universal History from Ephorus to Diodorus," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. J. Marincola (Oxford - Malden: Blackwell): 171-9.
- Mastromarco, G. 1992. "La commedia," in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica. I, La produzione e la circolazione del testo. 1*, ed. G. Cambiano, L. Canfora and D. Lanza (Roma: Salerno): 335-77.
- Mastromarco, G., Totaro, P. 2006, *Commedie di Aristofane. II* (Torino: UTET).
- Mazzarino, S. 1966. *Il pensiero storico classico*, I-III (Bari: Laterza).
- Mejer, J. 2002. "Eudemus and the History of Science," in *Eudemus of Rhodes*, ed. I. Bodnár and W.W. Fortenbaugh (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers): 243-61.
- Momigliano, A. 1993². *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Montanari, F. 2000. "Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature," in *Demetrius of Phalerum*, ed. W.W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers): 391-411.

- Mosshammer, A.A. 1979. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg - London: Bucknell University Press-Associated University Presses).
- Nesselrath, H.-G. 1990. *Die attische Mittlere Komödie. Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte* (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter).
- Nicolai, R. 1992. *La storiografia nell'educazione antica* (Pisa: Giardini).
- . 1995. “Κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί. Aspetti della fortuna di Tucidide nel mondo antico,” *RFIC* 123: 5-26.
- . 2004. *Studi su Isocrate. La comunicazione letteraria nel IV sec. AC e i nuovi generi della prosa* (Roma: Quasar).
- . 2006. “Thucydides Continued,” in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 693-719.
- Piccirilli, L. 1985. *Storie dello storico Tucidide. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento delle Vite tucididee* (Genova: Il Melangolo).
- . 1997. *Plutarco. Vite parallele. Le vite di Lisandro e di Silla*, ed. M. G. Angeli Bertinelli, M. Manfredini, L. Piccirilli and Giuliano Pisani (Milano: Mondadori).
- Podlecki, A. 1985. “Theophrastus on History and Politics,” in *Theophrastus of Eresus. On his Life and Work*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, P. M. Huby and A. A. Long (New Brunswick - Oxford: Transaction Books): 231-49.
- Porciani, L. 2001. *Prime forme della storiografia greca: prospettiva locale e generale nella narrazione storica* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Pownall, F. 2004. *Lessons from the Past. The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
- Preller, L. 1842. *De Praxiphane Peripatetico inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobili disputatio* (Dorpati: Schünmanni), reprinted in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze aus dem Gebiete der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Berlin 1864: Weidmann): 94-112.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1970. “Ippocrate e Tucidide,” in *Un augurio a Raffaele Mattioli* (Firenze: Sansoni): 453-64, reprinted in *Scritti sul mondo antico. Europa e Asia. Espansione coloniale, ideologie e istituzioni politiche e religiose* (Napoli 1976: Macchiaroli): 460-73.
- Radici Colace, P. 1979. *Choerili Samii Reliquiae* (Roma: “L'Erma” di Bretschneider).
- Rapp, C. 2002. *Aristoteles. Rhetorik, I-II* (Berlin: Akademie).
- Raubitschek, A.E. 1960. “Theopompos on Thucydides the Son of Melesias,” *Phoenix* 14: 81-95.

- Regali, M. 2008, "Satyrus," in *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi*, ed. F. Montanari, F. Montana and L. Pagani (www.lgga.unige.it).
- Rood, T. 2006. "Objectivity and Authority: Thucydides' Historical Method," in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 225-49.
- Rosen, R. M. 1995. "Plato Comicus and the Evolution of Greek Comedy," in *Beyond Aristophanes. Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*, ed. G. W. Dobrov (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 119-37.
- Rutherford, R. 2007. "Tragedy and History," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. J. Marincola (Oxford - Malden: Blackwell): 504-14.
- Schepens, G. 1980. *L'autopsie dans la méthode des historiens grecs du V^e siècle avant J.-C.* (Brussel: AWLSK).
- . 2007. "Zum Verhältnis von Biographie und Geschichtsschreibung in hellenistischer Zeit," in *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit*, ed. M. Erler and S. Schorn (Berlin - New York: de Gruyter): 335-61.
- Schöll, R. 1878. "Zur Thukydides-Biographie," *Hermes* 13: 433-51.
- Scholz, P. 1998. *Der Philosoph und die Politik. Die Ausbildung der philosophischen Lebensform und die Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Philosophie und Politik im 4. und 3. Jh. v. Chr.* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Schorn, S. 2004. *Satyros aus Kallatis* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Schwartz, E. 1897. "Die Berichte über die catilinarische Verschwörung," *Hermes* 32: 554-608.
- Snell, B. 1971⁴. *Leben und Meinungen der Sieben Weisen* (München: Heimeran).
- Sutton, D.F. 1989. *Dithyrambographi Graeci* (Hildesheim: Weidmann).
- Tulli, M. 2003. "L'Atene di Aspasia: tradizione del racconto e ricerca dell'ideale nel *Menesseno* di Platone," in *Evento, racconto, scrittura nell'antichità classica*, ed. A. Casanova and P. Desideri (Firenze: Università degli Studi di Firenze. Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità G. Pasquali): 91-106.
- . 2003a. "Omero nel III libro delle *Leggi*," in *Plato's Laws: from Theory into Practice*, ed. S. Scolnicov and L. Brisson (Sankt Augustin: Academia): 227-31.
- Tuplin, C.J. 1993-4. "The Reputation of Thucydides. A Note on Praxiphanes fr. 18," *Archaiognosia* 8: 181-97.

- Visconti, E.Q. 1808. *Iconographie ancienne ou Recueil des portraits authentiques des empereurs, rois et homme illustres de l'Antiquité*. I, *Iconographie grecque* (Paris: Didot).
- Voigtländer, H.-D. 1980. *Der Philosoph und die Vielen* (Wiesbaden: Steiner).
- Walbank, F.W. 1960. "History and Tragedy," *Historia* 9: 216-34, reprinted in *Selected Papers. Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography* (Cambridge - New York 1985: Cambridge University Press): 224-41.
- Wehrli, F. 1969². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. 9, *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Wilamowitz-Möllerndorff, U. von. 1877. "Die Thukydideslegende," *Hermes* 12: 326-67.
- . 1920². *Platon*, I-II (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung).
- Zahrnt, M. 2006. "Macedonia and Thrace in Thucydides," in *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, ed. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 589-614.
- Zanatta, M. 2008. *Aristotele. I dialoghi* (Milano: BUR).
- Zhmud, L. 2002. "Eudemus' History of Mathematics," in *Eudemus of Rhodes*, ed. I. M. Bodnár, W.W. Fortenbaugh (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers): 263-306.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Praxiphanes, Who Is He?

Elisabetta Matelli

The present new edition that recovers texts pertaining to Praxiphanes of Mytilene (also known as “of Rhodes”) aims to answer who this figure was. The name of Praxiphanes has not much evidence, although there is no shortage of evidence that he played no small role in the history of Hellenistic Greek culture.¹ I hope that this new collection will enable us to improve our knowledge of Praxiphanes, not so much because it contains a few more texts than the previous ones (the latest of which was Wehrli’s, 1969),² but because the data gathered now can be considered in the light of the great progress achieved in the last 50 years in our understanding of Hellenistic history and culture, especially concerning the importance of Rhodes as center of cultural and artistic elaboration and the role of philosophical schools, including the Peripatos, which were connected to each other by an intense dialectic that, even by way of polemics, allowed the opening of new ways of speculation.

¹ It seems possible to discard judgments such as those of Rossetti-Furiani (1993) 673 (“What little knowledge we have of his works does not allow us to ascribe him too prominent an intellectual role”) and Mygind (1999) 263 nr. 33, who sums up Praxiphanes’ production as only “on grammar, literary criticism, and historical writing.”

² Compared to Wehrli’s edition this one contains 10 more texts. An asterisk (*) signals probability, not certainty of attribution; the probability, however, is explained in the notes to the fragments and, I hope, in this article.

I am about to present a synthetic overview, which outlines a general picture gained both by studying the texts singularly, in the light of different possible interpretations, and by evaluating them in their necessary mutual relationships. For details on textual analysis I refer to the apparatuses in the edition (which report sometimes very relevant readings other than the ones adopted, as well as parallel passages), to the notes in the translations (containing the special bibliography to each source), and to the more detailed commentary.³

1. Praxiphanes of Mytilene

Praxiphanes, who is called a “pupil” and “friend” of Theophrastus (**4A-C**), stands out as someone connected to Aristotle’s successor not only because of chronology (around the 4th-3rd century BC), but also because of the common homeland, the island Lesbos, which is important for the history of the Peripatos, if we consider the fact that Aristotle, with Theophrastus’ cooperation, had conducted his studies on botany and zoology there, as well as leading a school there around 345-344 BC,⁴ that is, before he was appointed at the Macedonian court to educate young Alexander. This happened before he returned to Athens, where, around 335-334 BC, he finally founded the Lyceum.⁵

Theophrastus of Lesbos came from Eresos (1-2 FHS&G), together with another contemporary colleague of the school, Phantias (frs. 1-2 Wehrli), while Praxiphanes seems to have been born in the other city on the island, Mytilene (**1A = 10** and **7**, **1C = 9A** and **9B**). Strabo, in the section of his *Geography* dedicated to Lesbos, also reports that Theophrastus and Phantias came from Eresos,⁶ but he does not mention Praxiphanes among Mytilene’s important men⁷. He does, however, name him in the long list of *andres endoxoi* of Rhodes, which allows us to infer that a decisive part of his public activity must have taken place on that island (see below, 3. The Life). As I will try to argue, in a long life filled

³ A detailed commentary on every text published in the edition is contained in the Italian version *Prassifane: testimonianze e frammenti. Filosofia e grammatica in età ellenistica*, Milan 2012.

⁴ Flashar (1983) 232, Wehrli (1983) 477.

⁵ Wehrli (1983) 232-33.

⁶ Strabo, *Geographia* 13.2.4.

⁷ Strabo, *Geographia* 13.2.3.

with intense activities, Praxiphanes probably received honorary citizenships not only at Rhodes but also at Delos and, very likely, at Thespieae in Boeotia (which I infer from the content of the inscription *15).

We know the name of Praxiphanes' father, Dionysophanes (**1C** = **9A**) or Dionysiphanes (**1D** = **14**), and – according to a hypothesis I put forward – of his first-born son, who was named after his paternal grandfather, Dionousophaeis (*15). The variants are due to the differing dialectal spellings of the testimonia.

Praxiphanes son of Damosthenes, of Mytilene, who according to *IG* 12 Suppl. 127.13-17 (*16), an inscription from the end of the 3rd century BC, was awarded the honour of proxeny by the neighbour city of Eresos, could be a descendant or, at any rate, a relative in direct lineage.

2. The Life of Praxiphanes (called 'of Rhodes')

We may suspect that since Theophrastus, Phantias and Praxiphanes were roughly contemporaries, and since all came from Lesbos and were tied to the Peripatos in their adult life, they first made contact with each other on their native island. Diogenes Laertius cites a letter sent by Theophrastus from Athens to his friend Phantias about the didactic and communicative difficulties that occurred with gatherings of numerous, curious and insistent students.⁸ We will likely have to leave open the question whether Praxiphanes met Theophrastus and visited him on Lesbos or in Athens or in both places: there is no direct evidence that Praxiphanes ever lived in Athens, although that cannot be ruled out.⁹

⁸ Diog. Laert. 5.37 = Fr. 4 Wehrli (Phantias), Theophrastus 1 FHS&G.

⁹ In my opinion the only data on which one could base the contention that Praxiphanes worked at the Lyceum in Athens are the lists of philosophers of the Peripatetic school (from two different origins), in which the name Praxiphanes (see **3A-B** and **3C**) appears. Eudemus, on the other hand, a contemporary of his, is missing, but he left Athens around 322 BC, most likely to open the Rhodian branch of the Peripatetic school, in which Praxiphanes probably participated well into the 3rd century, see Gottschalk (1998) Mygind (1999) 254 nr. 2, Gottschalk (2002), Wehrli - Wöhrle - Zhmud (2004) 558, Matelli (2004) 303. Crönert (1906) 74 points out that Praxiphanes' name is missing in the list of schoolmates to whom Theophrastus leaves the school in the document reported in Diog. Laert. 5.2.5. This piece of information does not seem very significant, except to show that, if Praxiphanes was a pupil of Theophrastus in Athens, he probably left the city before the death of the master (see 3. Chronology below).

At some point Praxiphanes moved his activity to Rhodes. What drew him to that island? There is no lack of reasons why he could have left Athens (where the anti-Macedonian party kept endangering the survival of the Lyceum) and felt attracted to the rich Aegean island: Rhodes was politically independent, a naval power, served as a bridge between Attica and Egypt, had flourishing trade relations to the Ptolemaic kingdom, with corn, wine, oil, and other products, which led to exchanging people and ideas, and in the 4th-3rd centuries BC it attracted many kinds of intellectuals. Around 322 BC, Eudemus had created at Rhodes a branch of the Peripatetic school, which was subsequently joined not only by Praxiphanes but also by Hieronymus.¹⁰

Praxiphanes' stay at Rhodes is reported not only by Strabo, who counted him among the island's most renowned men (**13**), but also by other sources that call him "Rhodian" (**1B = 3A, 13, 19**). Besides, since there are no other famous people from Rhodes going by the name Praxiphanes I have accepted Aly's hypothesis that our Praxiphanes might be the person named on two handles of Rhodian amphorae found in a storage room in Alexandria of Egypt, which carry an inscription referring to an eponymous archon "Praxiphanes" (***17A** and ***17B**).¹¹ The two inscriptions probably come from two different amphorae: only one of them indicates, besides the year, which is determined by the archon's name, the month when the wine (or oil) was bottled, a practice that begins to appear in 246/240 BC, at first only occasionally, later on customarily.¹² If this identification is correct, we should imagine Praxiphanes occupying a position so important as to become – at least for a single year – no less than the eponymous archon, an office that at Rhodes usually coincided with that of priest of the Sun.¹³

¹⁰ See n. 9.

¹¹ Aly (1954) 1772.58-62.

¹² The months began to be indicated on handle-stamps around 246 BC (Period IIa) according to Conovici-Irimia (1991) 162, followed by Finkielsztejn (2001) 181-82, or around 240 BC according to Grace (1974) 194-200.

¹³ I am aware that there is no other evidence of a Rhodian eponymous archon named Praxiphanes. Therefore Finkielsztejn suggests that we should read 'Pratophanes,' – a more recent archon, see Finkielsztejn (2001) 192, who dates him ca. 188 BC – instead of 'Praxiphanes.' But I find that Praxiphanes (a rare name in the 3rd BC) is the *lectio difficilior* (i.e. *potior*) rather than Pratophanes of 188 BC, whose name has very common occurrences in stamps. The two stamps of Demetrius' collection seem to be lost, so we cannot check the reading. But it is difficult to suspect a misreading by Neroutsos, as Finkielsztejn supposes: Nilsson (1909) 45 corrects other readings of

Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.13 (= **13**), mentions a long list of renowned men at Rhodes, and some of the names cited, to which one could add others,¹⁴ can help us reconstruct the intellectual environment of the island at the time of Praxiphanes, in the 4th-3rd centuries BC. Strabo mentions the Peripatetic philosophers Pasicles (4th BC),¹⁵ Eudemus,¹⁶ and Hieronymus,¹⁷ the poets and grammarians of the Alexandrian school Simmias (4th-3rd century BC)¹⁸ and Apollonius (the author of the *Argonautica* of the 3rd century BC)¹⁹, both of whom, though Alexandrians, were called Rhodians, and similarly Dionysius Thrax, the famous Alexandrian grammarian, pupil of Aristarchus, of the 2nd century BC, who also fled from Egypt to Rhodes.²⁰ But besides these intellectuals listed by Strabo, there are many other personalities of the time who enrich the picture of the Rhodian cultural environment: philosophers such as Bion of Borysthenes, the itinerant philosopher author of diatribes, who left Athens for Rhodes, where he taught his philosophy,²¹ the sceptic philosopher Nicolochus, student of Timon of Phlius,²² Arideices, student of

Neroutsos, but not 'Praxiphanes,' that he quotes among the rare name of eponyms at p. 80. Pratophanes' stamps can be circular or rectangular and present the archon's name always accompanied by the name of the month when it is not stamped alongside the head of the sun or of a wreath [see Nilsson (1909) 154, 475 nr. 475, Finkielsztejn (2001) 120-121 and nrs. 128], so they seem to me to have formal characteristics different from the more simple ones represented by the two rectangular stamps with inscribed 'Praxiphanes' (with the addition of the name of the month in only one of the two cases). Let's remember that Praxiphanes of Mytilene, called "of Rhodes", is a personage who got the honor of proxeny in Delos in the middle of the 3rd BC because of his important services (see the text of **14**, *IG* 11.4 nr. 613). This inscription shows, I think, a relevant, continuous, political role of the 'Rhodian' Praxiphanes in favor of the Delians around 246-240 BC, a period when he probably had some important official jobs. I thank very much Gerald Finkielsztejn and Gonca C.-Senol for their kind replies to my questions about this subject, and I beg their pardon if, lacking proof of the contrary, I continue not to find evidence that Neroutsos misread the two stamps bearing the name 'Praxiphanes.'

¹⁴ Rossetti-Furiani (1993) 657-715, Mygind (1999).

¹⁵ Mygind (1999) 253 nr. 1.

¹⁶ See n. 9.

¹⁷ See Mygind (1999) 255 nr. 7-8.

¹⁸ See Mygind (1999) 271 nr. 65.

¹⁹ Apollonius Rhodius also composed mythological works on the foundation of Alexandria and Rhodes; see Mygind (1999) 272 nr. 69.

²⁰ See Mygind (1999) 263-64 nr. 34. I will refer to Dionysius Thrax toward the end and in the conclusions to this article.

²¹ See Mygind (1999) 254 nr. 4.

²² See Mygind (1999) 254 nr. 5.

530 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

Arcesilaus (Middle Academy);²³ rhetoricians such as Aeschines of Athens, after being defeated by Demosthenes in the *De corona* affair (330 BC), went to Ephesos (Lydia) and then worked in Rhodes;²⁴ historians such as Polyzelos,²⁵ Antisthenes²⁶ and Eudoxos²⁷; poets such as perhaps Erinna (from Rhodes, or Telos or Lesbos),²⁸ the poet and grammarian Philetas, tutor to Ptolemy II,²⁹ the comic poet or actor Agoranax, who is mentioned in an *Epigram* by Callimachus,³⁰ Antagoras author of the epic poem *Thebais*,³¹ Dionysius author of *Epigrams*,³² actors such as the tragic poets Acesios (who took part to the festival of Dionysus in Delos in 281 BC),³³ Dionysius,³⁴ Cleonicus (so famous as to be honoured with a proxenie in Oropos);³⁵ musicians such as Dexilaos, Sostratos and Nikon (an aulete active in Rhodes),³⁶ Socrates (aulete participant in a contest in Athens),³⁷ Lampon, the citharist,³⁸ and Piesicrates, the trumpeter.³⁹ The impressive Rhodian architecture of the time attracted important architects,⁴⁰ sculptors and painters. Strabo writes that

It (i.e. Rhodes) is remarkable also for its good order, and for its careful attention to the administration of affairs and of state in general; and in particular to that of naval affairs, whereby it held the mastery of the sea for a long time and overthrew the business of piracy, and became a friend to the Romans and to all kings who favoured both the Romans and the Greeks. Consequently it not only has remained autonomous but has also been adorned with many votive

²³ See Mygind (1999) 255 nr. 6.

²⁴ See Mygind (1999) 259 nr. 20.

²⁵ See Mygind (1999) 267 nr. 47.

²⁶ See Mygind (1999) 267 nr. 48.

²⁷ See Mygind (1999) 267 nr. 49.

²⁸ See Mygind (1999) 271 nr. 64.

²⁹ See Mygind (1999) 271 nr. 66.

³⁰ See Mygind (1999) 271 nr. 67.

³¹ See Mygind (1999) 272 nr. 68.

³² See Mygind (1999) 272 nr. 70.

³³ See Mygind (1999) 275 nr. 84.

³⁴ See Mygind (1999) 275 nr. 85.

³⁵ See Mygind (1999) 275 nr. 86.

³⁶ See Mygind (1999) 277 nr. 95, 278 nr. 100, 278 nr. 101.

³⁷ See Mygind (1999) 277 nr. 96.

³⁸ See Mygind (1999) 278 nr. 102.

³⁹ See Mygind (1999) 279 nr. 103.

⁴⁰ About Rhodian engineers and architects see Mygind (1999) 279-81 nrs. 108-118. The architect Philon, 3rd BC, from Byzantium, worked both in Rhodes and Alexandria, see Mygind (1999) 280 nr. 112.

offerings, which for the most part are to be found in the Dionysium and in the gymnasium, but partly in other places.

The best of these is, first, the Colossus of Helios, of which the author of the iambic verse says: “seven times ten cubits in height, the work of Chares the Lindian”. But it now lies on the ground, having been thrown down by an earthquake and broken at the knees. In accordance with a certain oracle, the people did not raise it again. This, then, is the most excellent of the votive offerings (at any rate, it is by common agreement one of the Seven Wonders).⁴¹

This passage records the enormous statue of Helios (32 metres tall), erected to commemorate the city’s successful resistance to the siege of Demetrius Poliorcetes, which an earthquake brought down in 224/23 BC: Chares of Lindos seems to have worked on it for twelve years (304 to 292 BC).⁴² Protogenes (end 4th century BC), born in Caunus, on the coast of Caria, but resident in Rhodes, was considered one of the best painters. He is said to have spent seven years on one picture, the “Ialysus,” which was still admired in Rhodes in the time of Cicero (Ialysus was a local hero, founder of the town of the same name in the island of Rhodes, probably represented as a huntsman) and to have worked continuously on another one, the “Satyr,” during the siege of Rhodes by Demetrius Poliorcetes (305-304 BC).⁴³

All these skilled personages seem to have been active in Rhodes around Praxiphanes’ time and they give us an idea of the rich multi-cultural environment he could not help but frequent while living in the island. The sources that inform us about architects and artists in Rhodes also give us a glimpse, albeit inadequate, of the wonderful masterpieces that adorned Rhodes at his time (full 3rd BC).

⁴¹ Translation by Jones (1929) 269. Strabo 14.2.5 θαυμαστή δὲ καὶ ἡ εὐνομία καὶ ἡ ἐπιμέλεια πρὸς τε τὴν ἄλλην πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν περὶ τὰ ναυτικά, ἀφ’ ἧς ἐθαλαττοκράτησε πολὺν χρόνον καὶ τὰ ληστήρια καθείλε καὶ Ῥωμαῖοις ἐγένετο φίλη καὶ τῶν βασιλέων τοῖς φιλορωμαίοις τε καὶ φιλέλλησιν· ἀφ’ ὧν αὐτόνομός τε διετέλεσε καὶ πολλοῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἐκοσμήθη, ἃ κεῖται τὰ μὲν πλεῖστα ἐν τῷ Διονυσίῳ καὶ τῷ γυμνασίῳ, ἄλλα δ’ ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις. ἄριστα δὲ ὃ τε τοῦ Ἡλίου κολοσσός, ὃν φησιν ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἱαμβεῖον ὅτι ‘ἐπτάκις δέκα. Χάρης ἐποίει πηχέων ὁ Λίνδιος.’ κεῖται δὲ νῦν ὑπὸ σεισμῷ πεσὼν περικλασθεὶς ἀπὸ τῶν γονάτων· οὐκ ἀνέστησαν δ’ αὐτὸν κατὰ τι λόγιον. τοῦτό τε δὴ τῶν ἀναθημάτων κράτιστον (τῶν γοῦν ἐπτὰ θεαμάτων ὁμολογεῖται).

⁴² Giuliano (1998) 420.

⁴³ Burn (2004) 155.

So in the rich Rhodes of the 3rd century BC we see the aspiration to attain an exceptional “greatness” as predominant, not only commercial and economic, but also artistic and cultural. It is interesting to see the idea of greatness pertaining to the Colossus exploited in the treatise *On the Sublime* (36.3). We can understand, therefore, why Callimachus, who advocated a poetic theory opposed to the concept of long poems and was all for cultivating a short, elaborate poetic form, identifies his enemies with the Telchines, the mythical heroes of Rhodes,⁴⁴ a metaphor he chose to strike at his opponents in an inflamed poetic *querelle*.⁴⁵ According to a later commentary, among the Telchines was our Praxiphanes (10). He was also, as we know, the specified addressee of a polemical work by Callimachus entitled *Against Praxiphanes* (11).⁴⁶

Rhodes is probably the place where Praxiphanes and the two Epicureans Philistas and Carneiscus met, became friends and talked to each other. Their names seem to point to their coming from the South Western coast of Asia Minor, perhaps from Cos.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Among the numerous sources see Diodorus Siculus 5.55: Τὴν δὲ νῆσον τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Ῥόδον πρῶτοι κατώκησαν οἱ προσαγορευόμενοι Τελχῖνες, “The so-called Telchines first inhabited the island called Rhodes.” We know, moreover, that at Rhodes, after the synoecism of 408/7 BC, one of the three *phylai* was named after the Telchines and that there was a two-fold mythical tradition about them: according to the first one they were semi-divine beings who did well to the humans by teaching them how to work metals, but according to the other, the one Callimachus draws on, they were so terrible as to deserve to be called “demons of the East” (Diod. Sic. 5.55, Strab. 14.2.7).

⁴⁵ Callim. *Aetia* I, fr. 1, Massimilla (1996) 57.1-20.

⁴⁶ I agree with the interpretation that, despite the semantic ambiguity of πρὸς + accusative, the title Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην (11) shows a polemic toward Praxiphanes, unlike what Rostagni 1927, 172-73 thinks. Nevertheless, I do not think that the opposition between the two men should be regarded, in an extremist manner, as total enmity. Brink writes: “In literature the combination of poetry and criticism that is so typical of Alexandria does not betray Aristotelian influence. Moreover, the very principles of Aristotle’s literary theory must have seemed outmoded to the dominant party. Callimachus himself is not an Aristotelian in spite of the Peripatetic character of his scholarly work. As a poet and critic he is opposed to Aristotle. His opposition grew out of, and was implied in, his poetry; it seems to have been argued explicitly in the book against Praxiphanes.” [Brink (1946) 12-16 and 25-6]. Callimachus’ Alexandrian environment was animated by learned disputes, as is shown by the verses of Timon of Phlius on the quarrels among philologists in Alexandria: πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολυφύλῳ / βιβλιακοὶ χαρακῖται ἀπείριτα δηριόωντες / Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ “many are pastured in Egypt of the manifold races, enclosed by book-walls, quarrelling endlessly in the Muses’ cages” [Timon Philius, *Suppl. Hell.* nr. 786, 372-73 = fr. 12 Di Marco (1989)].

⁴⁷ Capasso (1988) 35 and n. 32.

At some point during his stay on the island Praxiphanes received the citizenship and special honors at Rhodes. This is shown by the fact that, although he came from Mytilene, he is often referred to as “of Rhodes” and that, provided the interpretation I propose is correct (***17A-B**),⁴⁸ he became for at least a year (most likely around 240 BC)⁴⁹ eponymous archon and priest of the Sun, that is, one of the highest officials on the island, thus standing out among his numerous contemporaries, who were not at all obscure, for his trustworthiness and importance.

That he occupied important public offices seems also to be confirmed by a Delian inscription, *IG* 11.4 nr. 613 (**14**), in which he is given privileges (extended to his sons) such as proxeny, citizenship, and freedom from taxation “for having been and still being a benefactor and of great ‘utility’ to the island with words as well as deeds.”⁵⁰ As Scholz observes, an inscription that uses phrases like these is likely to be addressed to someone who has merits of public character.⁵¹

As one of our sources links Praxiphanes’ name with that of the epigrammatist Posidippus, mentioning both of them in the list of the Telchines attacked by Callimachus (**10**), it is worth pointing out that a Delian inscription from 257 BC, *IG* 11.2 nr. 225B5, tells us that Posidippus, *architheoros* (that is, the main *theoros*), in that year brought as an offer to the city of Alexandria a *phiale* (which was later on deposited in the sacred deposit of Delos called Porinos): “Phiale of the city of Alexandria from the *architheoros* Posidippos.”⁵²

Other Delian inscriptions from those years also contain Posidippus’ name;⁵³ considering how close this is to the date of the inscription awarding Praxiphanes the proxeny for ongoing merits,⁵⁴ we might well believe

⁴⁸ I discuss the issue on n. 13.

⁴⁹ Around this time the names of the months begin to be added to the eponymous archon’s name. Only one of the inscriptions that contain Praxiphanes’ name also displays the name of the month (**17B**). This practice seems therefore not yet to have become a rule.

⁵⁰ Haake (2007) 247-51 and n. 4.

⁵¹ Scholz (1998) 190 n. 19.

⁵² *IG* 11.2 nr. 225B5 = Posidippus T*4 Austin-Bastianini: φιάλη τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλεως ἐπ’ ἀρχιθεώρου Ποσειδίππου.

⁵³ *IG* 11.2 nr. 287B85 and nrs. 296B18, 298A121, 338Bc9, 358.6 Durrbach. See the observations of Homolle (1886) 69.

⁵⁴ The datings of *IG* 11.4 nr. 613 (**14**) vary: 270-60 BC [Roussel (1914) *ad loc.*, Haake (2007) 247]; middle-late 3rd century [see Marek (1984) 266, Wilamowitz (1925) 276 n. 1]. Capasso (1984) 395 and n. 24, however, thinks more confidently that the inscription “stems from the middle of the 3rd century or little later”, which he bases

534 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

that the ceremonies at Delos, too, were occasions on which Praxiphanes met with, talked to, and debated with poets and intellectuals of his time.

The inscription *IG* 7.1752.6-7 = *15 (3rd BC) makes me suspect that Praxiphanes received an honorary citizenship also at Thespieae, in Boeotia, at the foot of Mount Helicon, nearby where Hesiod was born. Only under this condition, in my opinion, can it be explained why his son (if it is correct to identify as such the young Dionousopaheis, son of Praxiphanes) is found in a military list of ephebes at Thespieae. This town had created a sort of museum for Hesiod, and Praxiphanes can be supposed to have gone there, taking a text of *Works and Days*, which he later reported lacked the preface (which invoked the Muses of Pieria, different from those of Helicon, who were sacred to that place and are, instead, present in the prologue of the *Theogony*), see **28A-28B**. If at Thespieae too Praxiphanes received a proxeny with citizenship rights, this seems to indicate that in this case his merits were not political but cultural, linked to Hesiodean studies and perhaps to a valuing of the valley of the Muses at the foot of Mount Helicon.

3. Chronology

Is it possible to gain any certain chronological data regarding Praxiphanes?

One piece of information, though stemming from late sources, that Praxiphanes was a friend and pupil of Theophrastus, is one of the pillars of his chronology. Theophrastus was born between 372 and 369 BC, replaced Aristotle as head of the Lyceum in 322 BC, and died between 288 and 285 BC.⁵⁵ If Praxiphanes attended the Lyceum in Athens, he probably left the city before his teacher's death: Theophrastus does not name him among the companions to whom he leaves the school.⁵⁶ Around 322 BC, Eudemus, the "purest of Aristotle's pupils",⁵⁷ had left Athens for Rhodes, where he had founded a school,⁵⁸ which apparently was to continue with Praxiphanes.

on the fact that it was Cherilos who proposed to honour Praxiphanes in that way, and Cherilos was son of Tarsinus, who was archon at Delos in 261 BC.

⁵⁵ Wehrli (1983) 477.

⁵⁶ See n. 9.

⁵⁷ Fr. 59 Wehrli (Eud.).

⁵⁸ Wehrli (2004) 558.

Scholars traditionally locate Praxiphanes' birth about 340/30 or 330/25 BC.⁵⁹ However, the informations gathered in the present edition confirm Scholz's idea that a lower date, 320/10 BC, is to be preferred.⁶⁰ The higher dating was prompted particularly by the need to reconcile Praxiphanes' chronology with a time in which Epicurus (341-271 BC) could have been his pupil, but in the meantime historical criticism has definitely overcome this problem (see notes on **6**).⁶¹

The necessity for a lower birth date, on the other hand, stems from the fact that, although we can imagine him as very long-lived, just like Theophrastus, most sources indicate he was involved in events that took place well into the 3rd century. We have already considered how the Delos inscription *IG* 11.4 nr. 61 (**14**) places the award of the proxeny to Praxiphanes around 250 BC, if not even some years later: the inscription specifies that he was still performing to the Delians' advantage in words and deeds.⁶² Therefore, he must still have been in the middle of his diplomatic activity (probably in the relations between Delos and Rhodes) about the middle of the 3rd century BC. Around 240 BC (if my interpretation is correct)⁶³ he was eponymous archon and priest of the Sun at Rhodes (***17A-B**). To these same years points his mourning for the death of Philistas, to whom he seems to refer in a piece of writing in which he justifies his sadness about the death of a friend, a text which the Epicu-

⁵⁹ Some proposed datings: according to Crönert (1906) 179, Praxiphanes lived from 340 to 250 BC, a hypothesis shared by Bignone (1936) 420-21, who saw Praxiphanes as contemporary with Epicurus (who had his epheby in 323 BC, at age 18, and died in 270 BC) and by Aly (1954) 1772.53-57; Wehrli (1983) 567 and Wehrli (2004) 603 place his birth in the last third of the 4th century BC; Cameron (1995) 231-32 argues he cannot have been born after 320 BC, probably even much earlier; he rules out the possibility that Praxiphanes, Posidippus and Callimachus could all have been alive in 245 BC; Dorandi (1999) places Praxiphanes' birth, generically, in the last quarter of the 4th century.

⁶⁰ Scholz (1998) 190.

⁶¹ I refer to the detailed account of the interpretations that have been proposed to solve the chronological problems posed by this passage in Matelli (2012) commentary on **6**. Here I will list but a few of the scholars who denied the trustworthiness of the news that he was Epicurus' pupil: Jacoby (1902) 354 nn. 2-3, Crönert (1906) 21, 175 n. 21, Isnardi Parente (1983²) 107 and n. 2, Aly (1954) coll. 1771.67-1772.6; coll. 1784.33-40 (s.v. Praxiphanes 2), Wehrli (Prax.) 106, Laks (1976) 66-68, Capasso (1984) 406-07, Capasso (1988) 56-55, Rossetti-Furiani (1993) 674, Gigante (1999) 121.

⁶² For the date of the inscription, see n. 54.

⁶³ See n. 13.

536 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

rean Carneiscus attacks in his work *On Friendship* (20a-20e). Philistas seems to have lived between 310 and 240 BC.⁶⁴

Praxiphanes' relationship to Aratos (7, 11) and Callimachus (10, 11) also points to his lifetime coinciding more or less with that of these poets, whose activity lies across about three quarters of the 3rd century.

As for the likely hypothesis that he arrived at Rhodes around 290 BC, I will discuss it in the following chapter, which deals with his school.

4. The School

We have already considered the testimonia according to which Praxiphanes was a friend and pupil of Theophrastus, which has made us consider the possibility that – perhaps in his teenage years – he might have attended the Lyceum at Athens, possibly from 304 on.⁶⁵

That he was not only a pupil, but also a philosopher of the Peripatos is documented in at least two lists of Peripatetics from different traditions:

Hesychius of Miletus, *Life of Aristotle* 9 (3C) records Theophrastus, Strato,⁶⁶ Praxiteles,⁶⁷ Lyco,⁶⁸ Aristo,⁶⁹ Lyciscus,⁷⁰ Praxiphanes, Hieronymus,⁷¹ Prytanis,⁷² Phormio,⁷³ Critolaos.⁷⁴

⁶⁴ I base this statement, with reservation, on Fraser - Matthews (1987) s.v. Φιλίστας, *Rhodos*, 463, where Philistas of Rhodes is dated to 310-240 BC on the basis of Agora Inventory R 257. So far, my research effort notwithstanding, I have not been able to view the inscription of this finding. I do not find very significant, on the other hand, the names of Carneiscus (father of one Hippodamus, merchant of wine and oil) and of Philistas on two ceramic amphorae from Rhodes (*IG* 12.1 nr. 1322 and nr. 1409) although they were seen by Crönert (1906) 75 with respect to our two personalities.

⁶⁵ On this issue see n. 9.

⁶⁶ Wehrli (1983) 569-74 (§ 28 *Straton von Lampsakos*).

⁶⁷ The name of a Peripatetic Praxiteles is absent from the list of scholars in Wehrli (1983) and Wehrli - Wöhrle - Zhmud (2004).

⁶⁸ Wehrli (1983) 576-77 (§ 29C *Lykon aus Troas*).

⁶⁹ Wehrli (1983) 579-82 (§ 30A *Ariston von Keos*).

⁷⁰ The name of a Peripatetic Lyciscus is absent from the list of scholars in Wehrli (1983) and in Wehrli - Wöhrle - Zhmud (2004).

⁷¹ Wehrli (1983) 575-76 (§ 29B *Hieronymus aus Rhodos*).

⁷² Ziegler s.v. Prytanis nr. 5 in *RE* 23.1 (1957) 1158.21-48, cf. Kassel (1985) 23-4; Wehrli (1983) 582 (§ 30B *Prytanis und Phormion*).

⁷³ Brink s.v. Phormion nr. 8 in *RE* 20.1(1941) 540.35-57, Wehrli (1983) *ibidem*.

⁷⁴ Wehrli (1983) 588-89 (§ 32A *Kritolaos von Phaselis*).

The *Duke Papyrus*, inv. G 178 col. 2.17-22 (**3A**) and Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35-39 (**3B**, **19**) list as Peripatetics Aristotle of Stagira, Theophrastus the Ionian, Strato of Lampsacus, Praxiphanes of Rhodes, Critolaos of Phaselus.

It is striking that in these lists we do not find Eudemus, who around 322 BC went back to Rhodes to open, it seems, a branch of the Peripatetic school.⁷⁵ Lacking information about Praxiphanes visiting Athens we do not know how long he lived in that city nor when he definitely left it. It is also striking that his name is missing in the testaments of Theophrastus (who died between 288 and 285 BC)⁷⁶ and his successor Strato (who died between 270 and 267 BC),⁷⁷ in which, however, other disciples are named. 288-85 BC is therefore an important *terminus ante quem*.

This leads me to the assumption that Praxiphanes left Athens some years before Theophrastus' death, and that he may have been called to Rhodes as a result of Eudemus' death, which left a hole in the Rhodian Peripatos. Because of its symbolic value I would assume for this move a date around 290 BC, when the city of Rhodes built the monumental Colossus, which was the symbol of the growing power of the island for almost the whole century, until it was destroyed by an earthquake in 224/3 BC.

I suppose that Praxiphanes lived on the island somewhat continuously, with a few "working trips" (certainly to Delos, probably to Thespieae in Boeotia, and likely also to Alexandria). Among his pupils the sources list Aratos (**7**, cf. **11**) and it is certain that he had a close relationship to Callimachus, which, I think, was not only polemical in nature (**7**, **10**, **11**). Due to the tight connections between Rhodes and Alexandria of Egypt, I assume that they might have frequented each other in the Ptolemaic city as well.

After staying in the Lyceum at Athens for a long time, Hieronymus of Rhodes likely returned to Rhodes around 261 BC.

Can we recognize some continuity between the research done by Eudemus, Praxiphanes and Hieronymus, that is, the most important figures of the Peripatos at Rhodes? The Project Theophrastus, with its recent publications on Eudemus and Hieronymus, has enabled us to improve our knowledge of these two philosophers. Nonetheless, their

⁷⁵ I refer again to n. 9.

⁷⁶ Diog. Laert. 5.51-57.

⁷⁷ Diog. Laert. 5.61-64.

distance with respect to scientific interests has prompted us to see a discontinuity in the history of the Rhodian school after Eudemus' death. Gottschalk has even suspected that "probably Eudemus' school did not survive him."⁷⁸

In my opinion, thanks to Praxiphanes we can see the history of Peripatos at Rhodes between the 4th and 3rd century BC in a new light. Therefore I will give a very synthetic outline of the life and work of Eudemus and Hieronymus, which provides the context in which to place the life and work of Praxiphanes.

Eudemus

Eudemus was probably born at Rhodes before 350 BC. He was a pupil of Aristotle in the Lyceum and a candidate for his succession when he died in 322-21 BC. He returned to his native island after Theophrastus was chosen in his place.⁷⁹ He seems to have played an important role as "editor" or "arranger" of Aristotle's works (an enterprise in which his nephew Pasicles participated as well):⁸⁰ he certainly worked on the *Eudemian Ethics* (which apparently received its name from the contribution Eudemus made to the publication of the work),⁸¹ on the *Physics*⁸² and the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle,⁸³ but we cannot rule out that he may have worked on other esoteric writing of the master as well. It has long since been recognized that the edition of the Aristotelian *Corpus* provided by Andronicus of Rhodes in the 1st century BC drew on the materials of Aristotle's library already systematized by Eudemus.⁸⁴ This leads to the assumption that the library of the Peripatos at Rhodes already possessed the works of the founder of the Lyceum in Eudemus' time. These were valuable manuscripts if – as it seems likely – Theophrastus wrote from Athens a letter to Eudemus (at Rhodes) asking him to check for him the reading of a doubtful passage in the fifth book of the *Physics* (5.226b14-16).⁸⁵

⁷⁸ Gottschalk (2002) 26.

⁷⁹ Wehrli (Eud.) frs. 2, 5; Wehrli (1968) 652-53; Wehrli (1983) 530.

⁸⁰ Wehrli (Eud.) 78 (fr. 4).

⁸¹ Wehrli (Eud.) 123 (fr. 151) Dorandi (2002) 48-51.

⁸² See Dorandi (2002) 41-44.

⁸³ Wehrli (Eud.) 111 (fr. 124); Dorandi (2002) 44-47.

⁸⁴ Moraux (1951) 319-21, Wehrli (Eud.) 78-9 (fr. 6), Gottschalk (2002) 33, 36, Dorandi (2002) 53-54.

⁸⁵ Wehrli (Eud.) fr. 6.

Gottschalk points out that Eudemus “concentrated on the hard core of Aristotle’s philosophy and most of his writings, like the *pragmateiai* of Aristotle and Theophrastus, were closely connected with his teaching.”⁸⁶ No exoteric works by him are known.⁸⁷

Eudemus’ works are all lost and those of which we have testimonia seem to proceed, above all, along the lines of Aristotle’s studies on logic, physics, and the history of science: a number of them follow a historical method, with histories of arithmetic, geometry and astronomy,⁸⁸ as well as an important theogony.⁸⁹ A small number of fragments describe the behaviour of animals.⁹⁰ Another section contains the surviving fragments of three texts of a systematic nature: *Analytica*,⁹¹ *Physics*,⁹² and *On Elocution* (*Peri lexeos*).⁹³

Wehrli does not include the important epigraphical testimony of Rhodes (*Chronicle* of the temple of Lindian Athena), which attributes to Eudemus a *Lindiakos*, an attribution which recent studies seem to confirm.⁹⁴ This work can be interpreted as a local story based on research on documents or, alternatively, as an epideictic speech (in this last case, an exoteric work).⁹⁵ The *Chronicle* of the temple of Athena Lindia also mentions the work *Heliaca* of Hieronymus of Rhodes. We

⁸⁶ Gottschalk (2002) 28.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁸ Gottschalk (2002) 28-29.

⁸⁹ Betegh (2002) 337-57; Matelli (2006) 402-03.

⁹⁰ Wehrli (Eud.) frs. 127-32, see Gottschalk (2002) 31.

⁹¹ Wehrli (Eud.) frs. 9-24, see Gottschalk (2002) 30.

⁹² Wehrli (Eud.) frs. 31-123, see Gottschalk (2002) 29-30.

⁹³ Περὶ λέξεως, Wehrli (Eud.) frs. 25-29, see Gottschalk (2002) 30-31.

⁹⁴ Wehrli (Eud.) 77: “Eudemus Identität mit dem gleichnamigen Verfasser einer Geschichte von Lindos, ΛΙΝΔΙΑΚΟΣ ist wenig wahrscheinlich.” I worked on the *Lindiakos* of Eudemus - cited four times in the *Chronicles* of the temple of Athena Lindia (B 10. 65-6, C 32. 67-8, D Ἐπιφάνειαι 47-8 and 87-8) - in Matelli (2006) 403-06, where I also provide a *status quaestionis*.

⁹⁵ I think it could have been a praise speech, epideictic, analogous to the *Encomium of Rhodes* by Egesias and the homonymous work by Miron, both cited in the *Chronicle of Lindus*, in C 4.32-33 and 10.64-65 [Higbie (2003) 78-9 and 197-98], in C 32.68 and in D Ἐπιφάνειαι 51-52 [Higbie (2003) 125-26 and 197]. At Lindus around 300 BC there seems to have been a very important occasion for an encomium *Lindiakos*: the rebuilding of Athena’s temple after the long-past fire of 392 BC. It seems its rebuilding is to be dated only after the siege by Demetrius Poliorcetes, that is, at the end of the century. Higbie (2003) 10-13 argues that this could have happened around 300 BC. An inscription from that time [Blinkenberg (1941) 242-64, nr. 51] mentions the names of hundreds of donors who financed the restoration and decoration of the statue of Athena

lack, on the other hand, testimonia of other writings by Eudemus on other topics such as poetics, rhetoric, biographies of renowned men, literary history and criticism, but in my opinion this only allows us to say *non liquet*, not to rule out altogether that he could have authored such works as well.

For a possible link to Praxiphanes, I would like to draw attention to the *Peri lexeos* by Eudemus, a work in several books. An important title, certainly linked to the lost work by Theophrastus, on which much has been written and for which the recent contributions of Schenkeveld and Fortenbaugh are fundamental.⁹⁶ The fragmentary information we have on the content of Eudemus' work almost exclusively addresses expressive aspects of the argument, relating more closely to dialectic than to questions of style in a rhetorical sense. Nonetheless, despite this lack of evidence, Fortenbaugh does not rule out that Eudemus too in his *Peri Lexeos*, in several books, corresponding to what Aristotle did in chapter 20 of the *Poetics*, could have concerned himself with the parts of elocution (μέρη τῆς λέξεως, a subject that recalls texts **24**, ***32** and ***33a-c** of Praxiphanes) and with poetic and oratorical style.⁹⁷

Recent criticism has noticed that Eudemus' scientific production, though aimed at continuing some of Aristotle's research, did not seek to overcome possible difficulties in it in an original way (this was rather Theophrastus' object), but to conserve Aristotle's books and their ability to be used as organized textbooks.⁹⁸ This forces us to imagine that Eudemus was thinking of a school environment. Gottschalk has synthetically compared Theophrastus and Eudemus as follows: "Theophrastus, we are told (72A FHS&G), was selective in his choice of subject-matter, touching lightly on those topics on which Aristotle had said all there was to say and concentrating on the ones whose treatment Aristotle had left incomplete. For him Aristotelianism was a living organism, capable of further development, but always in the lines laid down by its creator. Eudemus preferred to expound Aristotle's philosophy, point by point, as a complete system (fr. 98 Wehrli, Eud.)."⁹⁹ Nonetheless, Eudemus

and the cups used in the temple [Higbie (2003) 12 dates this inscription around 300 BC as well]. See Matelli (2006) 403-06.

⁹⁶ Fortenbaugh (1998) 186-87, Schenkeveld (1998) 67-80; Fortenbaugh (2002) 79-80, Fortenbaugh (2005) 120-24.

⁹⁷ Fortenbaugh (2002) 80-81.

⁹⁸ Gottschalk (2002) 33-36.

⁹⁹ Gottschalk (2002) 34. See also Betegh (2002) 355; Bodnar (2002) 187-89.

proved faithful to Theophrastus as well.¹⁰⁰ These considerations lead us to recognize the importance of the Peripatetic school at Rhodes in Eudemus' time, notwithstanding the lack of certain proof of its existence.

As a consequence, we imagine that Eudemus' death around 290 BC imposed the need for a successor, who can, or rather must, be identified as Praxiphanes. Eudemus' effort to ensure that Aristotle's books were conserved as well as possible, even at the price of not producing original work himself, may enable us to identify him, along with Praxiphanes, as one of those colleagues of Theophrastus who concerned themselves with the elements of elocution (*32), but certainly not as the author of the text reported, perhaps only indirectly, in *PHamb.* 128 (*33a-c), a text that for many reasons I would like to attribute to Praxiphanes: here a new 'grammatical' concept is introduced, *metousia*, presented as different from metaphor, under which are subsumed those cases where the analogy expresses a 'participation', from the genus to the species or from the species to the genus. This presupposes an author capable of originally developing a theory by Aristotle: such a thing does not look like Eudemus, but seems to point to Theophrastus' direct student, Praxiphanes.

Hieronimus

There is very little we can reconstruct of Hieronymus' life. Nevertheless, there is some evidence pointing to his leaving Athens once and for all after the death of Strato, who was succeeded by Lycon as head of the Peripatos (between 270 and 267 BC).¹⁰¹ I suspect he returned to his native Rhodes before 267 BC, the year when Antigonos – one of his supporters – waged open war against Athens, which lasted down to 262 BC.¹⁰² At Rhodes he certainly attended the Peripatos and consequently frequented Praxiphanes, whom he likely outlived.

The *Chronicle of Lindos* by Timachidas twice mentions in proximity of Eudemus' *Lindiakos* the writing *Heliaca* by Hieronymus. These two testimonia are omitted in Wehrli's edition, but are included in White's (nrs. 60A and 60B). The title *Heliaca* can, I think, refer to a work on the Rhodian cult of Helios and his descendants, who went down in

¹⁰⁰ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰¹ Wehrli (1983) 569.

¹⁰² On Hieronymus of Rhodes' returning from Athens to his native island see Matelli (2004) esp. 296-301.

mythology,¹⁰³ and enables us to recognize (as in Eudemus' case) a tight link between the philosophers and the island's reality.

Of Hieronymus works we are left with a fragment in natural science, *On Vision* (nr. 10 White), and 26 fragments on Ethics (nrs. 11-36 White). But we have above all testimonia of several works of his in the fields of History, Poetry, Literary critic and Rhetoric, titles of which are *On Poets* (nr. 41 White) in several books, comprehending a book *On Citharodes* (nr. 41 White), one on *On Tragedians* (nr. 42A White), *Letters* (nr. 30 White), *Historical Notes* (nr. 33-34 White), and *Miscellaneous Notes* (nrs. 47, 49 White), *On Isocrates* (nr. 38A White) or *On Isocratean Figures* (nr. 39 White).

I think that it is useful to consider the questions Hieronymus treated:

- Historical interpretations: fall of the tyrannies, in connection to the practice of ephebic and homosexual love, with conclusions of a socio-psychological nature (nr. 35 White).
- Rhodian local mythology (nrs. 60A-B White).
- Education of the young (nr. 31 White) and didactic methods (nr. 32 White).
- Lives of poets, philosophers and political leaders on the basis of anecdotes: Thales (nrs. 47-48 White); Empedocles (nr. 52 White), Sophocles (nrs. 43A-C White), Pericles and Anaxagoras (nr. 49 White), Socrates (nrs. 43A-C White), Phaedo of Elis (nr. 54 White), an anonymous female philosopher (nr. 55 White). Some cases highlight erotic aspects (nrs. 33-34, 36A-C White).
- Questions of attribution: works of Empedocles destroyed by his daughter; and his 43 tragedies (nr. 52 White).
- Chronological questions about poets and their work: Terpander (nr. 41 White).
- Criticism of poets and orators: the iambic version of Heraclitus by the poet Scythinus (nr. 51 White), Isocrates' use of verse rhythms (nr. 37A). Together with references from Rufinus (nr. 37B White),

¹⁰³ We read in Strabo 14.2.8 Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Τελχῖνας οἱ Ἡλιάδαι μυθεύονται κατασχεῖν τὴν νῆσον, ὧν ἐνὸς Κερκάφου καὶ Κυδίππης γενέσθαι παῖδας τοὺς τὰς πόλεις κτίσαντας ἐπωνύμους αὐτῶν “Λίνδον Ἰηλυσὸν τε καὶ ἀργινόεντα Κάμειρον.” “After the Telchines, the Heliadae, according to the mythical story, took possession of the island; and to one of these, Cercaphus, and to his wife Cydippê, were born children who founded the cities that are named after them, ‘Lindus, Ialysus, and Cameirus white with chalk’.” See discussion in Matelli (2004) 305-07.

this subject continues Aristotle and Theophrastus' interest in metrics and prose rhythm.

- Rhetorical style: a work *On the Isocratean Figures* (nr. 39 White).
- Questions of delivery, following works by Theophrastus and Demetrius of Phalerum (nrs. 38A-B White).
- An exegetical work on poetry: *The Shield* ascribed to Hesiod (nr. 45 White).
- Studies of acoustics: (Hieronymus is named with Aristoxenus and Dicaearchus (nr. 40 White).
- Grammatical observations on phonology and etymology (nr. 29 White).
- Studies on myth: Anagyrus and the *Phoenix* of Euripides (nrs. 42 A-C White), Tithonus (nrs. 46 A-B White).
- Rationalization of myth: a humanized Heracles (nrs. 44A-B White; cf. Euhemerus and Dicaearchus in Athens at the end of the 4th – first half of the 3rd BC, and the descent into Hades by Pythagoras and punishment of Hesiod and Homer, nr. 50 White).

The fragment of a library

With regard to these topics it is interesting to remember an important library catalogue of the 2nd century BC, inscribed on stone,¹⁰⁴ that lists titles of oratorical subjects: six works of Demetrius of Phaleron (Demetrius, fr. 80 SOD), three works of Egesia, two works of Theodectes of Phaselis, the first of which is the famous *Rhetoric Art* even in ancient times acknowledged to be an Aristotelian work,¹⁰⁵ fifteen works of Theopompus; and lastly, among five other unidentified authors, the orator Democles, disciple of Theophrastus.¹⁰⁶ All these authors date from the 4th to the half of the 3rd BC. This list of books, whose library of provenance is unknown,¹⁰⁷ suggests titles consistent with a Peripatetic tradition of rhetoric still flourishing on Rhodes at the end of the 2nd century BC. But I suppose that we might also think of a fragment of a wider catalogue of books that belonged to the Library of the Peripatetic school at Rhodes in the 3rd century BC, in Praxiphanes' and Hieronymus' time.

¹⁰⁴ My description is based on Segre (1935) 214-222.

¹⁰⁵ De Sanctis (1926) 65.

¹⁰⁶ Theophrastus, 18.6 FHS&G.

¹⁰⁷ Segre (1935) 220-222, Nicolai (1987).

Conclusions

This synthetic outline of the Peripatetic school of Rhodes, which was continued in the 3rd century BC by Eudemus, Praxiphanes and Hieronymus, seems to me to be necessary in order to provide a framework for the few fragments that contain titles of works and subjects treated by Praxiphanes. As we shall see, they enable us to conclude that he produced works that developed and transformed the philosophical inheritance from the foregoing century. There is a little evidence that the Peripatos at Rhodes in the 3rd century BC had not lost the systematic method of the philosophical *organon* that the school had in the 4th century, but its scholars, after Eudemus, investigated especially new, less explored aspects – although they were regarded as “minor”. Evidently they connected with the other philosophical schools and the cultural environment of Hellenistic times, which was markedly multicultural. We would be wrong to continue to understand Eudemus, Praxiphanes, and Hieronymus as philosophers of an age of decadence of the Peripatos, in which the big philosophical issues had been dropped. It is wiser to assume that most pieces of the mosaic are now lost, but we can, in many aspects, recognize in particular the indirect effects of their work. Men of their time contributed to the fundamental development of Western culture that took place in Hellenistic times.

5. The works

Only two titles of works by Praxiphanes can, in my opinion, be safely reconstructed (in many cases the expression used by the source does not allow us to distinguish them from the subject matter):

1. *On History*] Marcellinus, *Life of Thucydides* 29 (**18.1 = 21**)
2. *On Poems*] Philodemus, *On Poems* 5.2 (**18.2 = 27**, cf. **25, 28A-B, 29A-29B, 31**)

It is doubtful whether the two following sources give only a generic indication of the topic rather than the exact title:

3. *Plato's and Isocrates's Discussion on Poets*] ¹⁰⁸ **18.3 = 22**

¹⁰⁸ *Diatribè* indicates a dialogue on poets that probably does not have to be identified with the treatise *On Poems* (**27**), even if Heraclides of Pontus wrote one book *On Poetics and the Poets* (nr. 17.38 Schütrumpf), see Brink (1946) 23 n. 2, who interprets *On Poets* as the title of an acroamatic dialogue. Susemihl (1891) I, 145-46 et

4. *Composition (on Friendship)]* 18.4 = 20e

Recognizable as simply stating the subject matter of Praxiphanes' studies are the following ones:

5. *On Rare Words]* 18.6 = 30A¹-*30B and 316. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey]* 18.7 = 257. *A Commentary on Hesiod's Works and Days]* 18.8 = 28A and 28B8. *A Commentary on Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus]* 18.9 = 29A9. *A Commentary on a Passage of Plato's Timaeus]* 18.10 = 23A-and 23B10. *On the World]* 18.11 = 19

Even if the name of Praxiphanes is absent, I propose to attribute to him the work:

11. *On the Elements of Speech]* 18.5 = *32 cf. 24 and *33a-c

Is it possible to reconstruct the content of Praxiphanes' works? The notes and commentaries address the specific issues of each source. Here I will only give an account of cases that have posed interpretive difficulties of particular complexity; on the rest I will only give the outlines.

On History

To understand the nature of the work *Peri Historias* it is especially important to consider exactly what the source says:

Marcellinus, *Life of Thucydides* 29 (18.1, 21)

He (Thucydides) lived at the same time as Plato the comic playwright, Agathon the tragedian, Niceratus the epic poet, and Choirilus and Melanippides, as Praxiphanes says in his book *On History*. And until Archelaus was living,¹⁰⁹

n. 741, Podlecki (1964) 124, Rostagni (1926) 288 n. 1 and Janko (1991) 58 and (2000) 153 suspect that Praxiphanes' dialogue *On Poets* is the same work as *On Poems* (27).

¹⁰⁹ My translation follows a corrected reading: in the edition of the text I have changed the manuscript reading ἐπεὶ into ἔως, in the belief that, according to LSJ, the temporal meaning of ἐπεὶ is 'after that,' 'since,' 'when,' 'from the time when' (always with reference to some later time): a sense that I cannot understand in this context. Neither can I understand the causal meaning of ἐπεὶ. Aly (1954) 1777.34-37 thinks that Marcellinus truncated Praxiphanes' text, where it might have been said that some of the named poets contemporary to Thucydides visited Archelaus at Pella, but Thucydides never did, because he was not famous in Archelaus' lifetime. Tuplin (1993-94) 1888-89 thinks of a historical frame and that Thucydides might have visited Pella after Euripides' death (407/06 BC) and before Timotheus' arrival, or during a temporary absence of his.

546 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

(Thucydides) was unknown for the most part, as Praxiphanes makes clear, but later he was admired like a god.

To translate the title *Peri Historias* as *On History* is only one possibility. *Historia* could also simply mean “investigation” or “research”: for instance, this is a plausible interpretation of the corresponding titles in Theophrastus,¹¹⁰ and perhaps of *Peri Historias* of Zeno of Sidon.¹¹¹ Crönert supposes that Praxiphanes’ writing contained the result of historical and literary enquiries into the poets.¹¹² On the other hand, Marcellinus reports statements by Praxiphanes on the chronology and fortune of Thucydides, son of Olorus.¹¹³ This justifies interpreting that writing as a historiographical work.

The source gives little precise information: Praxiphanes claimed Thucydides was a contemporary of five poets (the comedian Plato, the tragedian Agathon, the epic poets Niceratus and Choirilus, and Melanippides, a writer of dithyrambs), and also observed that Thucydides, for the most part, had little fame, at least as long as the Macedonian king Archelaus was alive.

Interpreters have tried to establish a connection between the names of the five poets Praxiphanes chronologically associated with Thucydides and have concluded that all of them, or almost all, seem to have visited Archelaus’ court.¹¹⁴ Hence, considering that Praxiphanes cer-

¹¹⁰ See Theophrastus 196A, 727.7-8 FHS&G.

¹¹¹ *PHerc.* 1005 col. 7 lin. 16, fr. 12 Angeli - Colaizzo (1979) and Angeli (1988) 176.

¹¹² Crönert (1906) 176.

¹¹³ The hypothesis that Praxiphanes might have spoken not of the historian, but of the poet Thucydides (the last to be named in a list of the historian’s namesakes, but unlikely to have been referred to) was argued by Ritter 1845, 14 and 133; Jacoby (1954) 163 and (1955) 145, not ruled out by Piccirilli (1985) 112-13. However, the correct interpretation, in my opinion, is outlined in Tuplin (1992-94) 181-82, Canfora (1999) 49-65, and in Corradi’s contribution in this volume.

¹¹⁴ *Status quaestionis* in Tuplin (1993-94) 182 and 185-89. The first to argue for Thucydides going to the court at Pella was Wilamowitz (1887) 353-61, who later on, however, recognized the error: “Als Anfänger habe ich die überlieferten Notizen über das Leben des Thucydides behandelt. Damals lag mir daran, mit den wertlosen und widerspruchsvollen Angaben aufzuräumen, über die endlos und zwecklos hin und her geredet ward. Bezeichnenderweise beging ich selbst den Fehler, einer Notiz zu trauen, die auch auf einen Dialog des Praxiphanes zurückging, also auf historische Glaubwürdigkeit kein Anspruch hatte. Da sie fortfällt, besitzen wir außer den eigenen Zeugnissen des Thucydides nur eine Angabe über sein Grab” [Wilamowitz (1919) 12]. Trusting a historical framework found in Praxiphanes’ work, Tuplin (1993-94) 188-89

tainly wrote a dialogue between Plato and Isocrates on poets (22), most scholars have started to follow Hirzel¹¹⁵ in interpreting the *Peri Historias* as a dialogue on “history” between Thucydides and the five poets, set at Archelaus’ court, at Pella in Macedonia, and from this dialogue they assume the legend of Thucydides’ belated success also originated.¹¹⁶ The problems this interpretation poses are too numerous for me to share it; in particular, it goes too far beyond what the source tells us. Actually, it is surprising that it should have met with so much favour (even with Wehrli),¹¹⁷ even though Aly had warned already against Hirzel’s “fanciful” interpretation.¹¹⁸

I see no evidence that could enable us to conclude that Praxiphanes reported Thucydides to have been at the court at Pella. Aly’s opinion, on the other hand, seems acceptable: he thinks that Marcellinus in his report shortened the original text, thus obscuring its meaning, where Praxiphanes – Aly thinks – said that unlike the poets who, owing to their fame, visited the court at Pella, Thucydides did not go there because – as long as Archelaus stayed alive – he was not remotely as well-known as he was to become later.¹¹⁹

I prefer to follow whoever sees in *Peri Historias* a historiographical work.¹²⁰ We can translate the title *On History*. Tuplin himself, who defends the possibility of a dialogue, allows for the possibility that it may have been a treatise of this sort.¹²¹

has recently argued that Thucydides might have visited Pella after Euripides’ death (407/6 BC) and before Timotheus’ arrival, or during an absence of his.

¹¹⁵ Hirzel (1878) 46-49; Hirzel (1895) 311 n. 1; Wiliamowitz (1919) 12; Brink (1946) 24; Wehrli (Prax.) 112; Arrighetti (1987) 211-14; Gigante (1991) 60 n. 22; Tuplin (1993-94); Corradi in this volume. Actually, Preller (1842) 21 was the first to suggest that *On History* could have been a dialogue, and even imagined (with conscious boldness) that *Peri Historias* could be identified with the *diatribe* between Plato and Isocrates: “Si quid hallucinari liceat, hunc locum ex dialogo illo inter Platonem et Isocratem de poetis habito sumptum crediderim, quod cum temporibus optime conspirat, cum ipse Plato, quamquam longe alio consilio, Archelai regis meminerit in *Gorgia*, 471 et in *Alcibiade* II, 141 D.”

¹¹⁶ Praxiphanes would have drawn on the passage in Thucydides’ work in which the latter says that he is not about to use fabulous elements in order to achieve quick success, in which he is not interested (Thuc. 1.22.4). The topic of Thucydides’ fortune is treated in detail by Tuplin (1993-94) 189-96.

¹¹⁷ Wehrli (Prax.) fr. 18, 112.

¹¹⁸ Aly (1954) 1777.38-45.

¹¹⁹ Aly (1954) 1777.26-38.

¹²⁰ Aly (1954) 1776.68-1777.50, Mazzarino (1966) 514.

¹²¹ Tuplin (1993-94) 183-85.

In my opinion, Cameron correctly defines a characteristic of Praxiphanes' *On History* as “the earliest synchronized list of contemporary writers in a biography.”¹²²

To sum up, it seem to me that we have enough evidence to be sure that

1. The work *On History* contained historical and biographical research pursued by means of a dating system based on the time-relationships among different people;
2. Praxiphanes pointed out that Thucydides only became famous late.¹²³
3. This topic of the belated fortune of an important man seems one of the *topoi* of Peripatetic biographies, and became a trait of Alexandrian hypomnematic literature.¹²⁴

Three questions remain open:

Could Praxiphanes have been interested in the genres represented by the people considered in the synchrony: *history* with Thucydides, *comedy* with Plato, *tragedy* with Agathon, *epics* with Niceratus and Choirilos, and *dithyramb* with Melanippides? (Aly points out hat Praxiphanes concerned himself with a very particular poetic genre called *diatrichades*, cf. **31**).¹²⁵

Did he, by means of this synchrony, attempt to elaborate Aristotle's comparison of poetry and history?¹²⁶

What kind of relationship can be established between Praxiphanes' writing *On History* and the homonymous work by the Epicurean Zeno of Sidon (1st century BC)?¹²⁷

¹²² Cameron (1995) 196. Aly (1954) 1777.26-50 had already noticed in this passage the particularity of the historical dating method through synchrony.

¹²³ Wilamowitz (1887) 354, Tuplin (1993-94) 189.

¹²⁴ Arrighetti (1987) 213-14 is the first to draw attention to the parallelism with a biographical note on Euripides (that seems to go back to the Peripatetic Satyrus) which states that the tragedian, little appreciated in Athens, was successful, on the other hand, at the court of Archelaus in Macedonia (Satyrus, F *34 Schorn 2004): this might be a *topos* elaborated and developed within the Peripatos which entered into the commentaries and learned interpretations of Alexandrian times.

¹²⁵ So Aly (1954) 1777.48-50.

¹²⁶ Wehrli (Prax.) 112, Curradi in this volume.

¹²⁷ On this basis, Gigante (1998) 94 argues that Zenon Sidonius, teacher of Philodemus (1st century BC), in his book *Περὶ ἱστορίας* (*PHerc.* 1005 col. 7 lin. 16, fr. 12 Angeli - Colaizzo 1979 and Angeli 1988, col. 10 p. 176) worked on the prose style of the historians (cf. Philodemus, *On Poems* 5 col. 35.4) “forse in polemica col dialogo di Prassifane, il quale nell’orma aristotelica, che aveva scarsamente apprezzato la storia, lasciava giudicare sfavorevolmente Tucidide.” See below, n. 155.

With respect to this last comparison, it would be a *petitio principii* to try to explain the content of Praxiphanes' work in the light of Zeno's *Peri Historias*, of which we know too little and whose content Gigante assumes was polemical toward the work by Praxiphanes.¹²⁸

Nonetheless, the certainty of a dialogue between Epicureans and Peripatetics in the 3rd and 2nd centuries allows us to think of a connection between the two works, this taking place precisely in the field of grammar and literary criticism in which Praxiphanes became famous. Crönert already suspected that Zeno's *Peri Historias* followed the method of literary criticism developed at Rhodes by Dionysus Thrax (behind whom we see Praxiphanes).¹²⁹

On Poems

This work, attested by a papyrus fragment of the fifth book of Philodemus' *On Poems* (18.2 = 27), is another title that we can attribute to Praxiphanes with certainty. Its first book is cited, which obviously points to a work in several volumes. Philomelus, from whom Philodemus has his information, refers with precision to the first book of Praxiphanes' treatise, unlike with other authors whom he cites more generically. This makes think that Philomelus probably knew that work first-hand.¹³⁰

A lacuna interrupts the text exactly where Philodemus is explaining Praxiphanes' opinion about the relationship between content and form in poems:

Praxiphanes, on the other hand, affirms something different from (poetic) virtue in the first book of his *On Poems*. If there also are sometimes the facts ... to be there...¹³¹

Crönert, whose interpretation is shared by Mangoni, proposes to fill the lacuna so as to understand that, to Praxiphanes, "sometimes,

¹²⁸ See Gigante (1998) 94.

¹²⁹ Crönert (1906) 176. For the work of Zenon Sidonius see the references in n. 127 and 155. However, according to Angeli, Zenon's work did not contain 'grammar' or rhetoric as Crönert suspected but referred to a study on 'natural science' which studied heavenly phenomena in connection with natural science in the Epicurean sense, or to an gnoseological investigation connected to the inference dealt with in Philodemus' *On Signs* [Angeli - Colaizzo (1979) 96 and Angeli (1988) 285-869].

¹³⁰ See the discussion in Mangoni (1993) 47-49. This scholar informs that about Philomelus, an otherwise unknown author, we can only make hypotheses.

¹³¹ See Praxiphanes 27.

although the content is bad, the poet is good.” Jensen’s reconstruction, which is, however, not confirmed palaeographically, proposes a similar interpretation.¹³² According to this view, Praxiphanes spoke of a specific “virtue” (*areté*) in poems, consisting in formal elements (among which I think is not only *lexis*, elocution, but mainly *synthesis*, “composition”, as it is even more specifically poetic than the vocabulary).

This fragmentary quotation does not enable us to recognize with any certainty the content of this work in several books.

We can still observe a couple things:

- A. The title, to start with, is interesting. It seems to me that the Italian editor of Philodemus translates it by an ambiguous word, rendering Περὶ ποιημάτων (of both authors) with “On Poetry” instead of with “On Poems.”¹³³ The word *poiema*, however, shows that Praxiphanes must have written a treatise “on poems” (*On Poems*), a title missing in the lists of Aristotle and Theophrastus’ works, although they wrote some important books on poetry-related topics, which contain discussion on the *lexis* of poetic texts.¹³⁴ From Aristotle’s *Poetics* onward *poiesis* (in the sense of ‘poetry’) and *poiema* (in the sense of ‘poem’) are by no means synonymous,¹³⁵ even though a poem can (but does not have to) be called ‘poetry’.¹³⁶
- a. Striking is the absence of a literary work dedicated to poems (*poiemata*) in the lists of works attributed to authors of the Peripatetic school who, nevertheless, wrote works dedicated to single compositions or poets:
- Aristoxenus, a biography of the musician Archytas and a work on the tragedians;¹³⁷

¹³² See the apparatus to **27** linn. 31-34 and the commentary in Mangoni (1993) 219.

¹³³ Mangoni (1993) 170.

¹³⁴ To Aristotle [apart from the esoteric work *Poetics*, which has survived) the sources ascribe a dialogue in three book *On Poets*, cf. Tit. 2 nrs. 14-22 Gigon (1987) 263-67, a book on tragedies, cf. Tit. 136 Gigon (1987) 548] and writing on Homeric questions, cf. Tit. 118 nrs. 366-404.3 Gigon (1987) 526-539; to Teophrastus is ascribed a work *On Meters* (666 nr. 19 FHS&G), two works *On the art of Poetry* (666 nrs. 20, 21 FHS&G), and another book entitled *On Comedy* (666 nr. 22 FHS&G). See Brink (1946) 23 n. 2 and Dahlmann (1953) 7 n. 2.

¹³⁵ It is enough to read the [first chapter](#) of his *Poetic*.

¹³⁶ So Mangoni (1993) 81.

¹³⁷ Aristoxenus frs. 47-50 and 113-16 Wehrli.

- Demetrius of Phalerum, a dialogue *On Homer* and works on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*;¹³⁸
- Phantias, at least two books *On Poets*;¹³⁹
- Dicaearchus, *Summaries on the Plots of Euripides and Sophocles*,¹⁴⁰ a work *On Alcaeus*;¹⁴¹
- Hermippus Callimacheus, a commentary on Hipponax;¹⁴²
- Chamaeleon on Homeric questions (poetic genre and chronology) and Hesiod;¹⁴³
- Heraclides of Pontus, *On the Age of Homer and Hesiod*,¹⁴⁴ two books *On Archilochus and Homer*,¹⁴⁵ three books *On Issues in Euripides and Sophocles*,¹⁴⁶ two books of *Solutions to Homeric Questions*,¹⁴⁷ one book *On the Three Tragic Poets*¹⁴⁸ and one *On poetry and poets*;¹⁴⁹
- Hieronymus of Rhodes, a work *On Poets* in at least five books¹⁵⁰ and a commentary on the *Shield* of Hesiod;¹⁵¹
- Only Demetrius of Byzantium, cited by Philodemus (*On Poems* 5.2 col. 12.34-35) straight after Praxiphanes, and almost certainly to be identified with the Peripatetic of the 1st century BC mentioned by Athenaeus,¹⁵² seems to have written a work *On Poems* as Praxiphanes did.¹⁵³

¹³⁸ Demetrius of Phalerum fr. 118. 8-10 SOD. See Montanari (1999) 391-411.

¹³⁹ Phantias frs. 32 and 33? Wehrli.

¹⁴⁰ Dicaearchus of Messana nrs. 112-15B Mirhady (2001).

¹⁴¹ Dicaearchus nrs. 105-08 Mirhady (2001).

¹⁴² Hermippus fr. 93 Wehrli.

¹⁴³ Chamaeleon **15** and **25** Martano.

¹⁴⁴ Heraclides of Pontus nr. 17.28 Schütrumpf.

¹⁴⁵ Heraclides of Pontus nr. 17.29 Schütrumpf.

¹⁴⁶ Heraclides of Pontus nr. 17.31 Schütrumpf.

¹⁴⁷ Heraclides of Pontus nr. 17.34 Schütrumpf.

¹⁴⁸ Heraclides of Pontus nr. 17.36 Schütrumpf.

¹⁴⁹ In Aristotle's *Poetics* the writer narrows down its subject by specifying he will deal with *poiesis* (in the sense of a work performing a *mimesis*) while using the word *poiema* only to refer to metrical compositions, which can only be considered *poiesis* when they contain *mimesis*.

¹⁵⁰ Hieronymus of Rhodes nrs. 41, 42A White (2004).

¹⁵¹ Hieronymus of Rhodes nrs. 45 White (2004).

¹⁵² Athenaeus 10.77 (452d), 12.71 (548d) and 14.33 (633a-b).

¹⁵³ Mangoni (1993) 52 identifies the author of the work on poems mentioned by Philodemus with the Peripatetic Demetrius mentioned in Plut. *Cat. Min.* 65 and 67ff., who was therefore obviously a friend of the younger Cato.

- b. A title *On Poems* is attributed, apart from Praxiphanes, to Epicureans and Stoics of Hellenistic times. The Epicurean Metrodorus of Lampsacus, contemporary with Praxiphanes, wrote a treatise *On Poems* cited by Philodemus *On Rhetoric* 2.49.¹⁵⁴ Philodemus' teacher, Zeno of Sidon, wrote a work *On the Utility of Poems*.¹⁵⁵ Diogenes Laertius mentions the title *On Poems, addressed to Philomathes* in the list of works by the Stoic Chrysippus.¹⁵⁶ In the Epicurean school also Demetrius Lacon (2nd century BC) and Philodemus (1st century BC)¹⁵⁷ wrote *On Poems* in several books. On the Latin side, Varro composed (like Praxiphanes) a treatise *On Poems (De Poematis)* and one *On Poets (De Poetis)*.¹⁵⁸
- B. Praxiphanes' opinion is presented as opposed to that of other authors quoted by Philomelus, who maintain that a poet must be able to keep uniformity in the content (*ta pragmata*), in the characters (*ta ethe*) and in elocution (*lexis*). Philodemus retorts that this "virtue" applies to other genres as well (he mentions mimes and tales of extraordinary events) and is not confined to poetry. At this point he contrasts these theories with that of Praxiphanes, who reportedly says "something different about the virtue <typical of poems> in the first book *On Poems*." The few surviving words and the reconstructed ones lead to the assumption that Praxiphanes concerned himself specifically with the characteristics that set a poem apart from other forms of *poiesis*, following the Aristotelian theory that *poiesis* also includes works without metre, such as Xenarchus' mimes (characterized by rhythmic prose) and the Socratic dialogues.¹⁵⁹ Praxiphanes seems to have introduced a virtue particular to poems, which he deemed suf-

¹⁵⁴ Philodemus, *On Rhetoric* frs. 2-3 Longo Auricchio (1985) 33-34 (I think the title of Metrodorus, Περὶ ποιημάτων, too must be translated as *On Poems*, not *On Poetry*). See also Janko (2000) 133 n. 5.

¹⁵⁵ Gigante (1998) 94-95 reads fr. 12 linn. 19-20 of *PHerc.* 1005 col. 7 [Angeli - Colaizzo (1979)] Περὶ ποιημάτων χρηστών, *On the best poems*, instead of Περὶ ποιημάτων χρήσεως *On the utility of poems*, suggested by the edition of the papyrus text, that I follow. The same testimonium attributes to Zenon Sidonius, besides other titles, book entitled Περὶ ἱστορίας, *On History* (lin.16) and Περὶ γραμματικῆς, *On grammar* (lin. 15-16). See above, n. 127 and n. 129.

¹⁵⁶ Diog. Laert. 7.200 = *SVF* Crysippus II p. 9 lin. 17. See Dorandi (1994) 19-21.

¹⁵⁷ Romeo 1988. Here too the translator renders (which I think is misleading) the title of Demetrius Lacon's work Περὶ ποιημάτων as *On Poetry*.

¹⁵⁸ Dahlmann (1953) 7 n. 2.

¹⁵⁹ Arist. *Poet.* 1 (1447b9-13).

ficient to make a composition a *poiema*. I assume that this must have been, precisely, the ‘composition’ (*synthesis*), a subject that included attention to metres.¹⁶⁰ Philodemus mentions Praxiphanes by pointing out that he deals with the question of virtue as characterizing a poem in a “different” way from those authors who put the content at the same level as elocution. This kind of argument, Philodemus argues, applies also to texts in rhythmic prose such as mimes or in prose such as historiography, not specifically to poetry. What follows raises the suspicion that Praxiphanes introduced a virtue specific and necessary to *poiemata*. It is a virtue that, as I said, can only be identified with *synthesis*, which is enough to mark a poem as such, independently of its content.

Philodemus goes on to criticise more openly the doctrine of the Peripatetic Demetrius of Byzantium, whose assertions he considers too generic.¹⁶¹ After that, the Epicurean attacks in an even more detailed way Neoptolemus’ theory (which heavily influenced the debates on poetry in Augustan times at Rome as well):¹⁶² he criticises him for wrongly separating the ‘composition of *lexis*’ (*synthesis tes lexeos*) from the thoughts (*dianoemata*). Neoptolemus had elaborated his own idea of *poiema*, identifying it with the *synthesis* and separating it from the *poiesis* as ‘hypothesis’ in the sense of ‘subject.’¹⁶³ It bears asking to what extent these theories, elaborated under the influence of the Peripatetic school, may have continued along Praxiphanes’ lines.

The importance of *synthesis* in literary criticism, especially in Hellenistic and Roman times, is very well known,¹⁶⁴ and if Praxiphanes contributed to this topic in *On Poems* he may well have expanded a topic that was important and which Theophrastus had already

¹⁶⁰ It is possible that Praxiphanes paid attention to the metres characterizing the different genres of poems. See 31 on the hapax *diatrochades* (denominative of the verb *diatrochazein*), which defines a particular poetic genre. Demetrius Lacon uses the word *entrochazein* five times in the second book of his treatise *On Poems*: another hapax, but not a technical denominative as in Praxiphanes.

¹⁶¹ Mangoni (1993) 221 (commentary on col. 13.26 ff.).

¹⁶² Rostagni (1930) LXXV, Ardizzoni (1953) Mangoni (1993) 221-44.

¹⁶³ Philodemus, *On Poems* 5 col. 14 Mangoni (1993).

¹⁶⁴ The work by Dionysus of Halicarnassus, entirely dedicated to *synthesis*, stems from Augustean times. See Mazzucchi 2010, 278-292, who comments on the passages devoted to *synthesis* of the text in prose (which follows models from poems as well) in the treatise of Dionysus Longinus, *On the Sublime* 39-41. As reference work in general see Ardizzoni (1953) 57-120.

touched upon. This philosopher probably had, in turn, picked up and expanded on Aristotle's thoughts, themselves based on the work of Thrasy Machus and Theodectes. Dionysius of Halicarnassus at the beginning of his treatise *On synthesis* (Περὶ συνθέσεως 2) links the subject of his book to earlier research on dialectic and grammar within the Peripatetic school.¹⁶⁵ The *synthesis* seems to me to be the only element that assigns to poems specific features, different from those of prose, involving metre (see Dion. Hal. *On Synthesis* 3).

C. On the basis of some testimonia (**25, 28A-B, 29A-*29C**) Wehrli wondered if Praxiphanes wrote commentaries on Homer, Hesiod and Sophocles specifically.¹⁶⁶ However, one cannot rule out that he may have treated these authors in *On Poets* as well, a work stretching over several books. Although we cannot rule out their existence, we have no titles of such specific commentaries.

a. Praxiphanes noticed the 'inversion' of the natural order in the question of Anticleia to her son Odysseus and in his answer to her in *Odyssey* 11.187ff. (**25**). His remarks were picked up about a century later in Alexandria: Aristarchus seems to have been inspired by Praxiphanes' remarks on *deuteron proteron* in the verses of the *Odyssey* in developing his theory of Homeric usage. Praxiphanes had remarked upon the inversion of the natural order and, consequently, interpreted it as conforming to the *ethos* of the two Homeric characters: Odysseus, striving to please his mother, first asks her how she is doing and only afterward about his family, even though he wants first and foremost news about his wife and son; the mother, on the other hand, since she is 'savy', guesses correctly at Odysseus' feelings and starts by responding to them. According to my proposed reading of the papyrus, Aristarchus, pointing to a similar case of inversion in an Iliadic passage (2.763) 'proved' to Praxiphanes that such inversions are, instead, simply part of the Homeric style.¹⁶⁷ Remarking on the correspondence between *ethos* and words of the charac-

¹⁶⁵ Theophrastus 698-704 FHS&G; see Fortenbaugh (2005) 320-335 (with parallel passages and bibliography on this topic).

¹⁶⁶ Praxiphanes fr. 20-21 Wehrli "Homerkommentar," fr. 22a-b "Hesiodkommentar?"

¹⁶⁷ Matelli (2008) 42-60.

- ters, as Praxiphanes does, conformed to Aristotelian principles of literary criticism and to the idea of *prepon*.¹⁶⁸
- b. Praxiphanes dealt with the issue of the authenticity of the Preface to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (**28A-B**) by examining (maybe even in Thespieae itself) a manuscript of this work that lacked it. The source allows us to ascribe to Praxiphanes also the considerations about the poetic genre of this work, which deals with agricultural subject matter and for which, unlike for the *Theogony*, it would in his view not have been appropriate (*prepon* is the word he uses) to invoke the Muses at the beginning, let alone Muses not inhabiting Mount Helicon (at whose foot lay Hesiod's native town, Thespieae) but Muses from Pieria.¹⁶⁹
 - c. Praxiphanes also dedicated part of his activity to poetic vocabulary: according to one *testimonium* he studied a lemma whose meaning was not immediately clear as well as the expressive intention Sophocles pursued in the verse in which he used it (*Oedipus Coloneus* 900, **29A-*29C**). Besides, he explained another uncommon poetic word (**30A¹-*30B**), and his definition of it was passed on to late-antiquity and byzantine lexica, losing, however, the indication of its deviser.
 - d. Praxiphanes dealt with a very special poetic genre called *diatrochades* (**31**): this word is a *hapax legomenon*. The term might have been coined by Praxiphanes himself to define a poetic genre based on trochaic metre, or perhaps a “fast”, “improvised” poem (*diatrochazo* in the sense of ‘hasten’). The verb *historei* (which I translate as ‘Praxiphanes reports ...’) seems to indicate that Praxiphanes did research specifically on this subject, and this, in turn, seems to indicate that his work dealt even more intensively with poetic genres.
 - e. A *testimonium* from Demetrius proves that he commented on the following poetic passages (**24**):

Euripides, *Meleager* fr. 515 *TrGF* (5.1 p. 556);
Ilias 23.154
Odyssea 16.220, 21.226, 23.241

¹⁶⁸ On the concept of *prepon* in literary criticism see the fundamental study by Pohlenz 1933, to be reread in the light of the preface of its translator Lundon (1997) 5-11.

¹⁶⁹ Matelli (2009) 32-42.

This fragment reveals that his interest was in the connective particles used in these verses and prompts me to believe that he dealt precisely with this either in *On Poems* with respect to *synthesis* or – more probably – in a specific grammatical work of the sort ***32, *33a-c**. It must be ruled out as untenable that the treatise in several books *On Poems* is the same as the dialogue *On Poets* (**22**), despite the fact that this idea has found many supporters.¹⁷⁰

A dialogue on poets between Isocrates and Plato

Diogenes Laertius 3.8 (**22**) mentions a dialogue on poets written by Praxiphanes. Few lines, corresponding to those in the edition of Wehrli, fr. 11. Nonetheless, Vallozza, in the article published in the present volume, suggests that we refer a wider context of the source to Praxiphanes.

Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Philosophers* 3.7-8

Having returned to Athens, he (scil. Plato) lived in the Academy, which is a gymnasium outside the walls, in a grove named after a certain hero, Hecademus, as is stated by Eupolis in his play entitled *Shirkers*: “In the shady walks of the divine Hecademus.”¹⁷¹ Moreover, there are verses of Timon which refer to Plato: “Amongst all them Plato was the leader, a big fish, but a sweet-voiced speaker, musical in prose as the cicada who, perched on the trees of Hecademus, pours forth a strain as delicate as a lily.”¹⁷² Thus the original name of the place was Hecademy, spelled with e.¹⁷³ Indeed the philosopher (Plato) was also a friend of Isocrates. And Praxiphanes records a discussion about poets taking place at Plato’s country place, with Isocrates as guest.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰ Susemihl (1891) I, 145-46 and n. 741, Podlecki (1969) 124, Rostagni (1926) 288 n. 1 and Janko (1991) 58 and (2000) 153. Wehrli (Prax.) 96-98 presents the two titles together: *Περὶ ποιητῶν?* and *Περὶ ποιημάτων* in respect of the same section, where he gathers fr. 11-17, which correspond to our **22, 27, 24, 31, 10, 11, 7**: a heterogeneous mix of texts that does not allow to understand the specific nature of these testimonia. See Vallozza in this volume.

¹⁷¹ Eupolis, *Astrateutoi*, 36 Kassel-Austin.

¹⁷² *Silloi* of Timon of Phlius, 804 Lloyd-Jones-Parsons = 30 Di Marco.

¹⁷³ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Philosophers* 3.7 ἐπανελθὼν δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας διέτριβεν ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ. τὸ δ’ ἐστὶ γυμνάσιον προάστειον ἀλσῶδες ἀπὸ τινος ἥρωος ὀνομασθὲν Ἑκαδήμου, καθὰ καὶ Εὐπολὶς ἐν Ἀστρατεύτοις φησὶν· ἐν εὐσκίοις δρόμοισιν Ἑκαδήμου θεοῦ. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Τίμων εἰς τὸν Πλάτωνα λέγων φησί· τῶν πάντων δ’ ἡγείτο πλατίστακος, ἀλλ’ ἀγορητῆς ἡδυεπῆς, τέττιξιν ἰσογράφος, οἱ θ’ Ἑκαδήμου δένδρει ἐφεζόμενοι ὅπα λειριόεσσαν ἰεῖσιν. πρότερον γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ἐκκαδημίας ἐκαλεῖτο. ὁ δ’ οὖν φιλόσοφος καὶ Ἰσοκράτει φίλος ἦν. Up to this point I follow the English translation by Hicks 1938, vol. 1, 283.

¹⁷⁴ For the Greek text of Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Philosophers* 3.8 see **22**.

She argues that Diogenes took from Praxiphanes' dialogue the information on the Academy as a place in the countryside along with the citations of the two comic poets Eupolis and Timon and the detectable allusion to Plato's *Phaedrus*, which she claims gave Praxiphanes the idea of a discussion between Isocrates and Plato (see *Phaedrus* 278e) set in an idyllic place in the countryside, where the light wind responds to the nightingales' singing (*Phaedrus* 230b-e).

To this hypothesis one might add the one that the idea of a dialogue on poets with Isocrates as main character could have been given to Praxiphanes by a passage in Isocrates (*Panath.* 34) where the orator affirms that in that moment he prefers to talk politics and save the topic of poets for a later occasion. If this is so, Praxiphanes would seem to have used the biographical system called "of Chamaeleon", which inferred information on an author's life from his works. The same method Praxiphanes apparently uses also with respect to Thucydides' belated fame (see above in the comment on *Peri Historias*, **21**).¹⁷⁵

But what poets would Praxiphanes have had Plato and Isocrates talk about?

It must be ruled out (for the reasons expounded above) that the dialogue was the same as the one titled *Peri Historias* (**21**).¹⁷⁶ According to Ritschl, the dialogue on poets tackled the question of the prologue to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (**28A-28B**).¹⁷⁷ Walsdorff 1927 p. 39 argues that Praxiphanes in his dialogue on poets made Isocrates criticise Plato's style, for criticism of his style is apparent from a *testimonium* in Proclus (see **23A** and **23B**). For several reasons, I think that this interpretation is untenable.

Since Callimachus attacked on the one hand Praxiphanes (see **10** and **11**) and on the other the Platonic poetic theory, which appreciated political poetry, in particular Antimachus' elegy,¹⁷⁸ it seems more plausible to hypothesize that in this dialogue Praxiphanes made Plato express a positive view of Antimachus, who was liked also by Asclepiades of

¹⁷⁵ See the discussion of Schorn in this volume.

¹⁷⁶ Preller (1842) 21, Hirzel (1895) 311, Wehrli (Prax.) 112, Corradi's article in this volume. This possibility is not excluded by Tuplin (1993/44) 183-84.

¹⁷⁷ Ritschl (1866) 413.

¹⁷⁸ See Proclus *In Platonis Timaeum Comm.* 21 c [Diehl (1903) 90.20-26] = fr. 589 Pfeiffer (1949), Heraclides of Pontus nr. 8 Schütrumpf.

Samos and Posidippus of Pella, but hated by Callimachus: this work would have kindled the debate.¹⁷⁹

It is, therefore, absolutely plausible that in the dialogue Praxiphanes expresses, through Isocrates and Plato, literary criticism regarding some poets.¹⁸⁰ However, we have testimonies of other works *On Poets* (from the Peripatetic school as well) that display a historic and literary method that, in all probability, was not foreign to Praxiphanes' dialogue. Here follows a short list of such works, which began appearing in the 5th century with Glaucus of Rhegium, to whom is attributed an *On Ancient Poets and Musicians* (Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ μουσικῶν),¹⁸¹ and Damastes of Sigeum, who wrote an *On Poets and Sophists* (Περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν):¹⁸² they could have provided a first model of a historical-literary study to the Peripatetic school, which was attentive to pre-Socratic doxography and poetics. The dialogue *On Poets* (Περὶ ποιητῶν) by Aristotle¹⁸³ paved the way for a whole series of treatises on poets.

I have already referred to many titles of Peripatetic works on single poets, but in the context of Praxiphanes' dialogue it bears recalling that Phanias of Eresus authored a *On Poets*, in which there seems to have been an interest in biography,¹⁸⁴ and that the work *On Poets* of Hieronymus of Rhodes was very long, at least five books, and dealt with both the works and the lives (with anecdotes) of authors belonging to diverse poetic genres.¹⁸⁵ Heracleides of Pontus is credited with a work with the two-fold title *On Poetry and on Poets* (here too the *testimonia* disclose an interest in bibliographical anecdotes).¹⁸⁶ Worth remembering are also one *On Poets* by Lobos of Argos,¹⁸⁷ one by Dionysus of Phaselis¹⁸⁸ and one by Varro.¹⁸⁹ Tulli remarks on the fact that the dialogue *On Poets* by Aristotle was probably articulated around parallel characters and this

¹⁷⁹ For this hypothesis see Pfeiffer (1949) 408 (commentary on fr. 589).

¹⁸⁰ I refer to Vallozza's contribution, which elaborates on these topics.

¹⁸¹ Glaucus of Rhegium, 37 fr. 1-6 Lanata (1963).

¹⁸² Damastes, 32 fr. 1 Lanata (1963).

¹⁸³ Cf. above n. 134; see Lienhard (1950) 48.

¹⁸⁴ Phanias, fr. 22-33 Wehrli.

¹⁸⁵ See Hieronymus of Rhodes nr. 41-43 White.

¹⁸⁶ Heraclides of Pontus nr. 17.38 (cf. nr. 96-116) Schütrumpf.

¹⁸⁷ Garulli (2004).

¹⁸⁸ *Life of Nicander*, p. 3 lin. 3 Gow-Scholfield.

¹⁸⁹ On Varro's *De poetis*, Dahlmann (1953) 7 n. 2, Dahlmann (1963) 558.

method is likely to have provided a model for the dialogues on poets by Hieronymus, Phantias, and our Praxiphanes.¹⁹⁰

A work on Friendship

It is doubtful whether Carneiscus' comments (**18.4 = 20a-e**) regarding a work Praxiphanes dedicated on the death of his friend Philistas is evidence of a work *On friendship*. The writing in which he mourns the dead friend could just as well have had a different title.

Friendship had been the subject of Plato's *Lysis* as well. This subject was developed theoretically by Aristotle in books VIII-IX of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, in the seventh of the *Eudemian Ethics*,¹⁹¹ and in the *Magna Moralia* (II 15-17). *On Friendship* is the title of a work in three books by Theophrastus (which is lost and can only be reconstructed through fragments)¹⁹² and of one in two books by Clearchus.¹⁹³ Praxiphanes' work apparently inserted itself into this current, and the fierce opposition by the Epicurean philosopher makes probable that it faithfully expressed ethical principles typical of the Peripatos but not shared by the Garden. According to Hirzel, we do not have any evidence that it was a dialogue.¹⁹⁴

Carneiscus' text belongs to the second book of his work: we have no way of knowing whether the criticism of Praxiphanes occupied the rest of it, but at any rate it informs the whole fragment of the one preserved book. The Epicurean blames the Peripatetic for basing his reasoning in wrong and contradictory ideas and failing to address the true question of friendship. Praxiphanes' attitude toward a friend's death is, in the eyes of the Epicurean, an example of a wrong way of living, so Carneiscus goes so far as to call him a 'cheater': he even claims that anyone who followed his theories would be bound to live without a defence against fear and desire, that is, unhappily (see **20e**). Their polemic was inflamed.

A commentary on a passage of Plato's *Timaeus*

23A and **23B** show that Praxiphanes commented on an anomaly in Socrates' enumeration of the friends at the beginning of Plato's *Timaeus*

¹⁹⁰ Tulli (2007) 312.

¹⁹¹ Eudemus fr. 151, Wehrli (Eud.).

¹⁹² See the dissertation of Heylbut 1876 and Theophrastus 532-46 FHS&G.

¹⁹³ Clearchus frs. 17-18, Wehrli (Clearch.).

¹⁹⁴ Hirzel (1895) 310 n. 1.

(17a). Within the Peripatos, a judgment on Plato's style¹⁹⁵ was also passed by Dicaearchus¹⁹⁶ and Demetrius of Phalerum.¹⁹⁷ Praxiphanes' fragment does not point to a true commentary, so I am inclined to believe that he uttered his judgment on the Platonic passage in a work of a different kind, in a context in which they assumed a meaning lost on us.

Porphry, according to Proclus, responded "point by point" to Praxiphanes (evidently he could read the text itself, but we do not know if it was the original work or – as I think is more probable – of a quotation already broken out of the original contexts). Preller and Aly have criticized the strongly negative judgment of the two Neoplatonics.¹⁹⁸ Aly refuses to subscribe to harsh critiques on Praxiphanes such as that of Mützell (*vilissimum illius ingenium perspicitur abunde ex eiusd. Comm. In Tim. I.5*)¹⁹⁹ or Simon-Suisse, who regards Praxiphanes' critical remark as utterly childish.²⁰⁰

He had declared useless the enumeration at the beginning of the dialogue (the low number of those present did not require counting them) and, in particular, inconsistent in that a series of cardinal numbers ('one, two, three') is followed by an ordinal one ('fourth'). We cannot rule out that this criticism of the passage in question was set in a series of lines spoken in the dialogue *On Poets* between Plato and Isocrates, which is cited by Diog. Laert. 3.8 (= **22**).

These remarks on the inconsistency of a succession of cardinal and ordinal numbers, however, seem above all to recall Praxiphanes' interests in 'grammar' (in the sense connected to literary criticism that is explained in sources **9A**, **9B**, **9C** and reported by **24**, ***32** and ***33a-c**). In fact, if we consider the numeric inconsistency found in the *Timaeus* passage, Praxiphanes seems to look out for the use of numbers in a literary text, wondering when it is necessary to count and what distinctive function either series of numerals has. Praxiphanes sets apart in a precise way the different 'grammatical' function of the cardinal number (ἀριθμητικός) as opposed to the ordinal (τακτικός): we find the same distinction laid out in the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysus Thrax [§ 12.21-22 Uhlig (1883), 44.2-5].

¹⁹⁵ See Wehrli (Dem.Phil.) 82, Montanari (1999) 398-99.

¹⁹⁶ Dicaearchus nr. 48 Mirhady 2001.

¹⁹⁷ Demetrius Phal. nr. 133 SOD (2000).

¹⁹⁸ Preller (1842) 24, Aly (1954) 1781.57-1782.23.

¹⁹⁹ Mützell (1833) 279 n. *.

²⁰⁰ Simon-Suisse (1839) 54-56 et n. 2.

Finally, I would like to point out that the sources use words that are probably taken from Praxiphanes' text (ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ ἐκείνου μῦθος, Proclus concludes): the necessity of numeric consistency is expressed by *symphônôs* (συμφώνως τοῖς προειρημένοις) and by *akolouthon* (ἀκόλουθον γὰρ τῷ μὲν εἷς δύο τρεῖς τὸ τέτταρες, τῷ δὲ τέταρτος τὸ πρῶτος δεύτερος τρίτος).

On the elements (or parts) of speech

The evidence found in **9A, 9B, 9C, 24** and **28A-B** make me believe the texts reported in the Appendix as ***32** and ***33a-c** could be referred to Praxiphanes. In the apparatus to the Greek text, the notes to the translation and a special study²⁰¹ I deal with the question in detail; here it should be enough to maintain that Praxiphanes, following along the lines of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Eudemus, significantly continued the work of transferring to *lexis* the concepts linked to the parts (μέρη) and elements (στοιχεῖα) of *logos*, probably expanding on the topics touched upon. Parts (μέρη) and elements (στοιχεῖα) are two distinct concepts.

Clemens of Alexandria and two scholia to the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysus Thrax point to Praxiphanes as the 'first grammarian', a designation we are to understand in a meaning both new and superior to the past, that is, as 'literary critic' (**9A-C**).

Demetrius, *On Style* 55-8 (= **24**), cites Praxiphanes quite directly (his formulae are "as P. claims" / "as he says") in the chapter he devotes to 'fill-up particles' in the part of his treatise that deals with lofty style. These particles add to the stylistic effect when they are given the correct and precise meaning. The first example is an instance of δὴ in a passage of Plato's *Phaedrus* (246e); there follow two Homeric examples and, finally, two verses of the tragedy *Meleager*, of which the first is also mentioned by Aristotle, albeit for other reasons, in the *Rhetoric* (3.9 1409b9). Demetrius names Praxiphanes straight after the strong pathos expressed by δὴ in *Od.* 5.203-204, in order to remind the reader that according to him in some cases particles are used to convey lamentations and crying, as is shown by the formula καὶ νύ κ' (*kai ny k'*) that recurs in some Homeric passages where someone is complaining (see *Il.* 23.154; *Od.* 16.220; 21.226). Again referring to Praxiphanes as authority, who compared the use of particles as mere fill to *helas* and *ahi ahi*,

²⁰¹ Matelli (2012), commentary on **24, *32** and ***33a-c**.

which had no meaning whatever but were abundantly used by certain actors, Demetrius warns against using them without good reason.

The notion of “fill-up particle” is expressed in Demetrius’ text through a precise technical expression, παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι, literally ‘fill-up conjunctions’, which is not found in those Aristotelian texts that deal with conjunctions.²⁰² It could very well have been created by Praxiphanes himself.

This reflection on the fill-up particles shows that Praxiphanes is continuing on the lines of the linguistic reflection started by Aristotle: *kai ny ke* – which in itself could seem to be just noise or fragments of sounds without any meaning – if used properly can add to the meanings of a poetic text by filling in the gap left by the purely verbal message, much like the effect an actor can achieve when he expresses the text at hand in an effective way.²⁰³ This thought presupposes the research into noises, sounds, and voices that Aristotle had done in different kinds of writings, where he defines their differences.²⁰⁴ The question whether or not fill-up particles have a ‘meaning’ shows that Praxiphanes transfers to the literary criticism of poetic texts an issue of primary importance in the dialectic discussion on the parts of *logos* led in Aristotle’s *Categories* as well as in Aristotle’s treatise *On Elocution*.

In the *London Commentary* on the *Ars Grammatica* attributed to Dionysius Thrax (the same text that refers to our Praxiphanes as proto-grammarians, see **9C**) we read that in the Peripatetic studies on *logos* it had been debated whether conjunctions were to be regarded as ‘parts’ or as ‘paste’ between the parts:

The Peripatetics thought that there were two parts of discourse, nouns and verbs. They claimed that the rest were not parts but are inserted to provide links and paste. For in the same way as we say a ship is composed of the sides,

²⁰² I refer to *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*, as well as to [Aristotle] *Probl.* 19.20 (919a18-24).

²⁰³ This also goes back to an Aristotelian concept elaborated on the basis of the Sophist Thrasy Machos. See *Rhetoric* 3.1 (1404a12-16): ἐκείνη (scil. ἡ λέξις) μὲν οὖν ὅταν ἔλθῃ ταῦτὸ ποιήσῃ τῇ ὑποκριτικῇ, ἐγκεχειρήκασιν δὲ ἐπ’ ὀλίγον περὶ αὐτῆς εἰπεῖν τινές, οἷον Θρασύμαχος ἐν τοῖς ἑλέοις· καὶ ἔστιν φύσεως τὸ ὑποκριτικὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἀτεχνότερον περὶ δὲ τὴν λέξιν ἔντεχνον. “If there is cultivation of style, the same effect will be achieved through recitation: about this some people have attempted to speak briefly, like Thrasy Machos in *Compassions*. The ability to recite is a natural gift independent of art, but the one regarding style is an art.”

²⁰⁴ The Stoics inherited from the Peripatetics their studies on voices and sounds, see Pohlenz (1939) 45-47 = 157-59, Schenkeveld (1990) and Ax (1989).

the steering-paddle and the tackle, but we do not regard as parts of the ship the peach, the flax and the nails, as they are inserted to provide links and paste, in the same way the noun and the predicate are part of the *logos* but the rest is not.²⁰⁵

This allows us to assign to Praxiphanes the work *On the elements of language* (*32), which Porphyry and Simplicius attribute to Theophrastus and his school colleagues, who studied the elements and parts of the speech systematically in close connection with both the dialectic categories and the elements of elocution.

The fragments of *PHamb.* 128 (*33a-c) – about which the ‘high’ dating is especially striking, for it refers to the end of the 3rd century, the century when Praxiphanes lived – display a grammatical text aimed at systematizing the parts and elements of poetic *lexis* with respect to categories formulated by dialectics.

Here a synthetic outline:

linn. 1-11: the problem of defining what a ‘noun’ is seems to be addressed in a semantic and dialectical perspective, as is shown by the expression *oudemian ousian dêloun* referring to the meaning of the syllables.

linn. 12-20: the big lacunae prevent us from reconstructing the content. Snell p. 41 thinks this could deal with the difference between *kyria onomata* (words common in every-day speech) and *glossai* (foreign or dialectal words, referring specifically to their different endings. This distinction is well defined in *Poet.* 21 (1457b3-6).

linn. 20-32: lines even more lacunous than the previous ones. Snell suggests to integrate *syn(onymon)* or *syn(onymia)* in linn. 20-21, and he consequently assumes the following examples to contain cases of synonymy between proper words (*kyria*) and rare or foreign ones (*glottai*) [Snell (1954), 41].

linn. 33-64: the synonymy between glosses and words that are *kyria* is sided by the analogy typical of metaphors. The definition of meta-

²⁰⁵ *Scholium Londinense in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* 11, Hilgard (1901) 515.19-25: Οἱ Περιπατητικοὶ δύο μέρη λόγου ἐδόξασαν εἶναι, ὄνομα καὶ ῥῆμα· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα οὐ λέγουσιν εἶναι μέρη λόγου, ἀλλ’ ἔνεκεν συνδέσεως καὶ κόλλης παραλαμβάνεσθαι· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πλοίοις μέρη λέγομεν εἶναι τοὺς τοίχους καὶ τὰ πηδάλια καὶ τὸ ἄρμενον, τὴν δὲ πίσσαν, στυπεῖον, ἥλους οὐ λέγομεν εἶναι μέρη τοῦ πλοίου, ἀλλ’ ἔνεκεν συνδέσεως καὶ κόλλης παραλαμβάνεται, οὕτω τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα μέρη ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα οὐ. It is the same source as that of our 9C.

phor is presented in a very simple way as transfer of a noun or verb from a given thing to something similar. There follows an articulate definition of the different kinds of epithets, which can be simple but can also consist of two or three elements. To the metaphor based on analogy and to the epithet is contrasted the *metousia* as a special kind of metaphor that moves from the gender to the species or from the species to the gender: it appears as an innovative and general element with respect to Aristotle's metaphor, but cannot be likely attributed to Theophrastus.

Compared to the Aristotelian texts, *PHamb.* 128 at some points displays instances of incompleteness and superficiality²⁰⁶ that I think might point to it being condensed from a former text, longer and more articulate, but now lost. Praxiphanes seems to me to be the most likely author of such a 'grammatical' work written according to the Aristotelian models, both for chronological reasons – his works are very close to the date of the papyrus itself – and because his writings were well-known and read in Egypt in his same age, see **10** and **11**).

Some scholars attribute to Theophrastus the text of *PHamb.* 128,²⁰⁷ but according to Innes' plausible opinion, if Theophrastus had written this text the concept of *metousia* would have been more successful.²⁰⁸ It is Schenkeveld, however, who puts forth the most objections to Theophrastus as the author of the papyrus text.²⁰⁹ I sum up his conclusions: the papyrus cannot be regarded as a text on the virtues of expression (which is Theophrastian subject matter); it could be an *Ars poetica* of Hellenistic times, strongly influenced by Aristotle, but it is more likely that it is one of the first 'grammatical handbooks' (τέχναι γραμματικάί) based on research into the language of poetry.²¹⁰ As for its author, Schenkeveld argues that "the author may have been one of those other men who have written on elements of speech and are referred to by Porphyry."²¹¹ Fortenbaugh too doubts Theophrastus wrote that text, which is published as Appendix 9 in the edition FHS&G.²¹²

²⁰⁶ See the remarks of Schenkeveld (1993) 74; Fortenbaugh (2005) 260.

²⁰⁷ Theophrastus is assigned the grammatical text of *PHamb.* 128 by Lucas (1968) 202; Calboli (2007) 137-41; with some room for doubt Guidorizzi-Beta (2000) T 30.

²⁰⁸ Innes 1985, 252.

²⁰⁹ Schenkeveld (1993) and (1994) 292.

²¹⁰ Schenkeveld (1994) 292: "it may be an *ars poetica* but could also be a parallel to Dionysios' *Parangelmata*."

²¹¹ Schenkeveld (1993) 80.

²¹² Fortenbaugh (2005) 265-66.

On the world

Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35-39 (**19**), who claims that Praxiphanes concerned himself with properly philosophical topics (on cosmology and on the soul), staying faithful to the teachings of his teacher Theophrastus, who was, in turn, faithful to Aristotle, locates him in an orthodox environment inside the Peripatos. This is no surprise considering the Rhodian Peripatetic tradition begun by Eudemus, who himself stayed in tune with the master's teachings and continued his wide-ranging philosophical research.²¹³ The five Peripatetics (Aristotle, Theophrastus, Strato, Praxiphanes and Critolaus), whose doctrine was expounded by Epiphanius, are the same people referred to in *PDuke* inv. G 178 (a coincidence suggesting a common doxographical source, see the footnotes to **3A**, **3B**, **3C**). Epiphanius' testimony, vague though it is,²¹⁴ is somewhat useful nonetheless, for it shows (albeit in very general terms) that Praxiphanes' concerns kept the width of the masters' philosophical horizon, which appeared as a complex 'system'.

6. Conclusions

Despite the comparative lack of evidence, Praxiphanes appears one of the main figures of the lively intellectual life of the 3rd century: from Lesbos a young man born in the last decades of the 4th century goes to Athens to attend one of the great philosophical schools, the one since time closely connected to his native island, the Lyceum; then he moves to Rhodes, which was getting richer and richer and was placed in a strategic position in the Aegean as a connecting point between Athens and Egypt. There, at the end of the 4th century, a branch of the Peripatos was very likely opened by Eudemus, whom Praxiphanes may have succeeded after his death around 290 BC. He was soon sided by Hieronymus. Rhodes, rich and multicultural as it was from the 3rd century on, favours the meeting of different schools and thinkers. The nature of Praxiphanes' works cannot be understood except within this lively culture, where confrontation, debates, and discussions (which probably did not hinder friendship) permitted the elaboration of new spaces for artistic creativity and scientific research.

²¹³ Wehrli - Wöhrle - Zhmund (2004) 558.

²¹⁴ See Sharples (1998) 104, Huby (1999) 20 and Sharples in this volume.

A few examples.

In ethics, the Epicurean Carneiscus develops, in complete opposition to Praxiphanes, the topic of pain at the death of a friend in his work *On Friendship* (20): Praxiphanes, by admitting from an ethical point of view the possibility of suffering for the passing away of a friend, seems to have given continuity to the ethical principles of Aristotle and Theophrastus, thus challenging his Epicurean colleagues to deepen the reasons for a different interpretation of death and friendship.

The poet-and-philologist Callimachus develops in Alexandria his poetic ideal of a *lepton*, ‘subtle’ kind of poem, in stark opposition not only to contemporary poets such as Posidippus and Asclepiades, but also to an ‘influential’ theorizer like Praxiphanes, to whom he even dedicates a writing (see 10, 11).

A century later, the Alexandrian philologist Aristarchus starts a fictive dialogue with Praxiphanes, who had pointed out the stylistic strangeness of a passage of the *Odyssey* containing two instances of *hysteron proteron* and explained it with good poetic elaboration connecting in a coherent way the characters with their thoughts and words. Aristarchus replies to him by showing something different, that is, the same inversion taking place in a passage of the *Iliad* as well. From this observation he comes to his original theory of *hysteron proteron* as Homeric *usus* (25). Aristarchus also concurred with Praxiphanes in declaring the prologue to Hesiod’s *Works and Days* spurious (28).

A pupil of Aristarchus, Dionysius of Alexandria – who was forced to leave his city because of the violence of Ptolemy the 8th – settled at Rhodes and became famous as Dionysius Thrax.²¹⁵ He wrote, apart from Homeric studies, the first *Ars Grammatica* (2nd – 1st century BC).²¹⁶ The definition of ‘grammar’ with which this treatise begins enables us to interpret the epithet ‘first grammarian’ attached to Praxiphanes in 9A-C:

Grammar is the empirical knowledge of the normal usages of poets and prose writers. Its six divisions comprise:

1. Skill in reading (aloud) with attention to prosodic features.
2. Interpretation, taking note of the tropes of literary composition found in the text.
3. The ready explanation of obscure words and historical references.

²¹⁵ Pfeiffer (1968) 266 explains that the Alexandrian Dionysius was given the name ‘Thrax’ because the name of his father Τήρης was deemed of Thracian origin.

²¹⁶ Pfeiffer (1968) 266-272.

4. Discovery of the origin of words.
5. A detailed account of regular patterns.
6. A critical assessment of poems; of all that the art includes this is the noblest part.²¹⁷

Dionysius Thrax very probably benefited not only from the legacy of Alexandrian grammatical studies, but also from that coming from Rhodes, where Praxiphanes had left behind works informed by a method the mark of which is visible in the *Ars* of the Alexandrian grammarian and which had probably also been received by the Stoics who lived on the island. Perhaps we cannot attribute to Dionysius the exact wording of the extant text of the *Ars Grammatica*,²¹⁸ nevertheless, the particles (24) as well as the series of ordinal and cardinal numbers (23) belong to the normative section of this work. Above all, what seems most clearly to point to Praxiphanes is the method described in the introductory chapter, which claims that only someone who has ‘grammatical’ categories can critically read and understand a text.

Besides, this has prompted me to attribute to Praxiphanes, for the first time, two texts that have so far been assigned to Theophrastus (*32 and *33a-c) but which in my opinion we can understand and explain better if we refer them to a pupil from a subsequent generation, who thus deserves the title ‘first grammarian’.

His method seems to have been both faithful to the school’s teachings and capable of innovation.

Praxiphanes gave continuity to the Aristotelian method of the dialogue in *On Poets* (22), but he seems also to have started, with great originality, a new genre represented by the work in several books *On Poems* (27): from Praxiphanes on this title will be popular and be continued in the treatises of the Peripatetic, Epicurean, and Stoic schools up to the Latin grammarian Varro and Horace’s reflection on poems. Praxiphanes concerned himself with poetic vocabulary (29 and 30),

²¹⁷ Dionysius Thrax *Ars Grammatica* (§ 1 Uhlig 1883, 5.1-6.3) Γραμματική ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεύσιν ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. Μέρη δὲ αὐτῆς ἐστὶν ἕξ· πρῶτον ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβῆς κατὰ προσω-δίαν, δεύτερον ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους, τρίτον γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις, τέταρτον ἐτυμολογίας εὗρεσις, πέμπτον ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὲ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ. The translation is by Kemp 1986, 346.

²¹⁸ This issue is raised by Di Benedetto (1958-1959), but see Calboli (2007) 124-25 with n. 5.

‘composition’ (*synthesis*, see 24, 27), word order and the order of thoughts (*taxis*, see 25). He strived to find a valid criterion to assess the authenticity of poems (28). He was also interested in a minor poetic genre (31). His biographical research left a mark in *On Poets* (22) and in *On History* (23).

If, as I have claimed, he wrote a work on the parts of speech, evidence of which we find in *32 and *33a-c, he continued the work of the masters (Aristotle, Theophrastus, Eudemus) and began to build a bridge between the dialectical categories of ἐνδιάθετος λόγος (‘the internal speech,’ represented by the mind) and the elements and parts of the προφορικὸς λόγος (‘delivered speech’),²¹⁹ which is expressed in various ways according to the genre at hand. With his fidelity to the masters he seemingly contributed to the birth of a ‘grammatical’ way of reading – that is, informed by literary criticism and rhetoric – which maintained a unitary view on language: a ‘systemic’ method present in the *Ars Grammatica* of Dionysus Thrax, and of which I think the Stoics had elaborated some aspects especially from contemporary Peripatetic studies.²²⁰ It is possible that Praxiphanes’ research on the elements of speech, thank to the fact to be dealt in Rhodes just in the 3rd BC, set in motion a great deal of the literature on rhetorical and poetic elocution inspired by the Peripatos, which has left its mark in Hellenistic and Roman times, a mark scholars have so far traced back mostly to the Περὶ λέξεως by Theophrastus.²²¹

The criticism applied to the prologue of Hesiod’s *Works and Days* with its invocation of the Muses of Pieria fully conveys the Peripatetic method: Praxiphanes argues that it is spurious because it was not contained in an ‘authoritative’ manuscript that he viewed himself (probably not far from Thespieae at the foot of Mount Helicon, where the Heliconian Muses were honored), and additionally based on the rhetorical/poetic principle of *prepon*, for the solemn invocation of the Muses was not regarded as appropriate for a poem with agricultural subject matter.

I finally would like to recall that he, though being from Lesbos, managed to integrate himself fully in the intellectual, artistic, social,

²¹⁹ I deal with the subject of the ἐνδιάθετος λόγος (‘internal speech’) and προφορικὸς λόγος (‘delivered speech’) according to Theophrastus and the Stoics in Matelli (1992).

²²⁰ I deal with this issue in Matelli (1992).

²²¹ See the discussion in Fortenbaugh (2005) 120-24 no. 666 (17a), who gives the most important bibliography on the subject.

and probably also political life of Rhodes, to such an extent as to be remembered as ‘Praxiphanes of Rhodes’ as well as ‘of Mitylene’ (see above 2. The life). At Rhodes he occupied positions so important (see the commentary on ***17A-B**) that he was chosen to be a diplomat on behalf of Rhodes in dealing with Delos, a task of which he apparently discharged himself to the Rhodians’ satisfaction, who gave him and his sons the honour of citizenship (**14**). One might also hypothesize that he received the same honour at Thespieae in Boeotia as well (see commentary on ***15**), presumably for taking part in the ‘cultural promotion’ of that place through his studies on Hesiod. Praxiphanes appears to have highly valued this poet, who, we know, played a great role in Hellenistic debates on poetry and in Callimachus’ poetic theory, as well as attracting the attention of Hellenistic grammarians.²²² In the same Rhodian cultural context of Praxiphanes’ Peripatos, Hieronymus probably commented *The Shield* attributed to Hesiod, and the contemporary Apollonius Rhodius criticized the authenticity of this Hesiodic poem.²²³

Rhodes’ relevance as the place where he was active deserves attention in these lines devoted to a conclusive synthesis. In the 3rd and 2nd century the island, with its wealth, political independence and hospitality, harboured intellectuals of diverse natures and provenience, facilitating confrontation and communication between philosophers of the Cynic, Epicurean, Peripatetic, Platonic, and Stoic schools. In the 1st century Rhodes began to be visited by Romans attracted to ‘grammatical’ and ‘rhetorical’ schools. Pfeiffer points out that L. Aelius Stilo (among others) “who accompanied Q. Metellus Numidicus in the year 100 BC into his voluntary exile to Rhodes, was decisively influenced by Dionysius’ instruction.”²²⁴ Numerous other young Roman men (including the likes of Marcus Antonius, Caesar, and Cicero) went to Rhodes on account of the importance of the schools, and Pfeiffer writes that Dionysius Thrax’ forced exile had the positive effect of bringing to Rome the best part of Alexandrian education, from which the Romans had formerly kept away, preferring Pergamon.²²⁵ That Roman philology and rhetoric came from Rhodes has been known for a long time, in particular thanks to scholars of ancient ‘grammar’ such

²²² Cingano (2009) 101-09, Hunter (2009) 253-69; Montanari (2009) 313-42, Sitakou (2009) 219-52.

²²³ Hieronymus, fr. 45 White. See Martano (2004) 457-54, specially pp. 465-72.

²²⁴ Pfeiffer (1968) 266.

²²⁵ Pfeiffer (1968) 267.

as Pfeiffer and Calboli, who highlighted the importance of that meeting of cultures. Even in those studies, however, Praxiphanes was only the name of a Peripatetic active at Rhodes, who did not stand out in any way and, in particular, lived in the shadow of the masters' fame.

With this new edition of the testimonia on Praxiphanes I hope to have contributed to this new historical and cultural reconstruction: Praxiphanes' philosophical activity in the 3rd century appears to have faithfully continued the teachings of the masters without lacking the ability to innovate (I am thinking especially of the new genre of the treatise *On Poems* and the elaboration of the idea of metaphor as *metousia* on *33b, which I think could very well be his).²²⁶ He also set in motion a dialogue, which continued for a long time, with the Alexandrian grammarians and Stoic and Epicurean philosophers (let us not forget Panaetius' and Posidonius' presence at Rhodes in the 2nd and 1st century, 13). Therefore, I think that grammar and rhetoric as taught successfully on the island in the 2nd and 1st century may have reabsorbed and elaborated a great deal of Praxiphanes' Peripatetic teaching, which from Rhodes consequently passed, albeit indirectly, to Rome. In Latin literature we find works that show signs of the teachings of the Rhodian grammarians, which in turn conserve 'metabolized' elements of Praxiphanes' 'grammatical' work: at least Cicero's juvenile work *De inventione*, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and the two Varronian treatises *On Poets* and *On Poems*.²²⁷

²²⁶ PHamb. 128 linn. 59-63b= *33b presents *metousia* (literally 'participation'), as a metaphor taken from the adjacent element, which proceeds 'from species to gender' or 'from gender to species.' The logical category of these two typologies of metaphors, which Aristotle assigns to a single gender (*Poet.* 21, 1457b6-9), the author sets apart from that of metaphor by analogy by using the term *metousia*. The extant text of the papyrus does not give examples, but the two kinds of *metousia*, 'from species to gender' resp. 'from gender to species,' correspond to the two special forms of metaphors that, from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.43-44) onward, will be called 'metonymy' and 'synecdoche,' [see Chiron (2001) 214-15 and Calboli (2007) 141-42]. It seems to me that 'metonymy' (*denominatio*) and 'synecdoche' (*intellectio*) can be considered developments of *metousia* that probably matured precisely in the Rhodian environment.

²²⁷ See Calboli (2007) 123-46 on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Cicero's *De Inventione*, and Calboli (1964) 10-11 on Varro's *On Poets* and *On Poems*.

Works cited

- Aly, W. (1954). "Praxiphanes 1," *RE* 22.2, 1769.30-84.32; "Praxiphanes 2," in *RE*, 22.2: 1784.32-40.
- Angeli, A. ed. (1988). *Agli amici di scuola (PHerc. 1005)* (Napoli: Bibliopolis)
- Angeli, A., Coliazzo, M. (1979). "I frammenti di Zenone Sidonio," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 9: 47-133.
- Ardizzoni, A. (1953). ΠΟΙΗΜΑ. *Ricerche sulla teoria del linguaggio poetico nell'antichità* (Bari: Adriatica).
- Arrighetti, G. (1987). *Poeti, eruditi e biografì. Momenti della riflessione dei Greci sulla letteratura* (Pisa: Giardini)
- . (2006). *Poesia, poetiche e storia nella riflessione dei Greci. Studi* (Pisa: Giardini)
- Betegh, G. (2002). "On Eudemus Fr. 150 (Wehrli)," in Bodnar-Fortenbaugh (2002): 336-57.
- Bignone, E. (1936). *L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione filosofica di Epicuro*, 1-2, (Firenze: La Nuova Italia) [quoted after 1973², edizione accresciuta].
- Blinkenberg, Chr. (1941). *Lindus. Fouilles de l'Acropole 1902-1914*, II, *Inscriptions* (Berlin - Copenhagen: De Gruyter).
- Bodnar, I. (2002). "Eudemus' Unmoved Movers: Fragments 121-123b Wehrli," in Bodnar - Fortenbaugh: 171-89.
- Bodnar, I., Fortenbaugh, W.W., eds. (2002). *Eudemus of Rhodes. RUSCH 11* (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- Calboli, G. (1997). "Presentazione," in Dahlmann, H., *Varrone e la teoria ellenistica della lingua*, presentazione, note di commento e bibliografia a c. di G.C., trad. ital. di P. Voza (Napoli: Loffredo): 9-13.
- . (2007). "The metaphor after Aristotle," in *Influences on Peripatetic Rhetoric. Essays in Honor of W.W. Fortenbaugh*, (Leiden - Boston: Brill): 123-50.
- Capasso, M. 1984. "Prassifane, Epicuro e Filodemo. A proposito di Diog. Laert. X 13 e Philod. Poem. V IX, 10-X,1," *Elenchos* 5: 391-415.
- . (1988). *Il secondo libro del Filista (PHerc. 1027)*, edizione, traduzione e commento a cura di M. Capasso (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Chiron, P. (2001). *Un rhéteur méconnu: Démétrios (Ps.-Démétrios de Phalère), Essai sur les mutations de la théorie du style à l'époque hellénistique* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin).

- Cingano, E. (2009). "The Hesiodic Corpus," in Montanari - Rengakos - Tsagalis (2009): 91-130.
- Crönert, W. (1906). *Kolotes und Menedemos* (Leipzig: E. Avenarius).
- Dahlmann, H. (1953). *Varro's Schrift De Poematis und die hellenistisch-römische Poetik* (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur).
- . (1963). *Studien zu Varro De poetis* (Wiesbaden : F. Steiner Verlag GmbH).
- De Sanctis, G. (1926). "Epigraphica. VII. La biblioteca di Rodi," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica*, N.S. 4: 63-73.
- Di Benedetto, V. (1958). "Dionisio Trace e la *techne* a lui attribuita," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 27: 169-210.
- Di Benedetto, V. (1959). "Dionisio Trace e la *techne* a lui attribuita (continuazione e fine)," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 28: 87-118.
- Di Marco, M. (1989). *Timone di Fliunte. Silli* (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo).
- Diehl, E. ed. (1903). *Procli Diadochi In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria*, 1 (Lipsiae: Teubner).
- Dorandi, T. (1994). *Filodemo, Storia dei Filosofi: La Stoà da Zenone a Panezio* (Leiden: Brill).
- Erler, M., Schorn, S. eds. (2007). *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit. Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 26.-29. Juli 2006 in Würzburg* (Berlin - New York: De Gruyter).
- Finkielsztejn, G. (2001). *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ. Premier bilan*, BAR International Series 990 (Oxford: Archaeopress).
- Flashar, H., ed. (1983a). *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Band 3, *Ältere Akademie. Aristoteles-Peripatos*, (Basel - Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- . (1983b). 'Aristoteles,' in Flashar (1983a): 175-457.
- ., ed., (2004) *Die Philosophie der Antike*, Band 3, *Ältere Akademie. Aristoteles-Peripatos*, 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage (Basel: Schwabe).
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. (1998). "Theophrastean titles and Book Numbers: Some Reflections on Titles Relating to Rhetoric and Poetics," in *Fragmentsammlungen philosophischer Texte der Antike*, edd. W. Burkert, L. Gemelli Marciano, E. Matelli and L. Orelli, *Aporemata* 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 182-200.

- ., Schütrumpf E., eds. (2000). *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion*. RUSCH 9 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- ., White, S., eds. (2004). *Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes, Text, Translation and Discussion*. RUSCH 12 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- .. (2005). *Theophrastus of Eresus, Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought, and Influence. Commentary, VIII, Sources on Rhetoric and Poetics* (Leiden - Boston: Brill).
- .. (2007). “Biography and the Aristotelian Peripatos,” in Erler-Schorn (2007): 45-78.
- Fortenbaugh, W.W., Huby, P.M., Sharples, R.W., Gutas, eds. (1992). *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought & Influence*, I-II (Leiden - New York - Köln: Brill).
- Fraser, P.M., Matthews, E. (1987). *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, I, The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Gabrielsen, V. (1999). *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, eds. V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle, Aarhus.
- Garulli, V. ed. (2004). *Il Peri poiêtôn di Lobone di Argo* (Bologna: Patron)
- Gigante, M. (1999). *Kepos e Peripatos. Contributo alla storia dell'aristotelismo antico*, Elenchos 29 (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Gottschalk, H. (1998). “Eudemos,” in *Der Neue Pauly*, 4 (Stuttgart - Weimar: J.B. Metzler): 216-19.
- .. (2002). “Eudemus and the Peripatos,” in Bodnár-Fortenbaugh (2002): 25-37.
- Gow, A.S.F., Scholfield, A.F. (1953). *Nicander. The Poems and poetical fragments* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Guidorizzi, G. – Beta, S. (2000). *La metafora* (Pisa: ETS 2000).
- Haake, M. (2007). *Der Philosoph in der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in der hellenistischen Poleis* (München: Beck).
- Heylbut, G. (1876). *De Theophrasti libris περὶ φιλίας*, Diss. Philol. (Bonnae).
- Hicks, R.D. (1938). Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of eminent philosophers*, with an English translation, 1-2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, - London: Heinemann).

- Higbie, C. (2003). *The Lindian Chronicle and Greek Creation of their Past* (Oxford: University Press).
- Hirzel, R. (1895). *Der Dialog. Ein Literarhistorischer Versuch*, I, (Leipzig: Hirzel).
- Homolle, Th. (1886). *Les Archives de l'Intendance sacrée a Délos (315-166 av. J.-C.)*. Thèse présentée a la Faculté des Lettres de Paris par Th. Homolle (Paris).
- Hunter, R. (2009). "Hesiod's style: towards ancient analysis," in Montanari - Rengakos - Tsagalis 2009: 253-69.
- Huby, P.M. (1999). *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary*, 4, *Sources on Psychology* (Leiden: Brill).
- Innes, D.C. (1985). "Theophrastus and the Theory of Style," in *Theophrastus of Eresus: On his Life and Work* (New Brunswick - Oxford: Transaction Books): 251-67.
- Isnardi Parente, M. (1983²). *Opere di Epicuro* (Torino: Utet).
- Kassel, R. (1985). "Der Peripatetiker Prytanis," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 60: 23-24.
- Jacoby, F. (1902). *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- . (1954). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (FGrHist)*, III b, Supplement [Text] (Leiden: Brill).
- . (1955). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (FGrHist)*, III b, Supplement [Noten] (Leiden: Brill).
- Janko, R. (1991). "Philodemus' *On Poems* and Aristotle's *On Poets*," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 21: 5-64.
- . (2000). *Philodemus On Poems, Book 1* (Oxford: University Press).
- Jones, H.L. (1929). *The Geography of Strabo* (London: Heinemann - Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- Kemp, A. (1986). "The *Techne grammatike* of Diunysius Thrax, Translated into English," *Historiographia Linguistica* 13: 343-63.
- Laks, A. (1976). "Édition critique et commentée de la Vie d'Epicure dan Diogene Laerce (X. 1-34)," in J. Bollack-A. Laks, *Études sur l'Épicurisme antique* (Lille: Publications de l'Université): 1-118.
- Lanata, G. (1963). *Poetica pre-platonica: testimonianze e frammenti*, testo, traduzione e commento (Firenze: La Nuova Italia).
- Lienhard, M. K. (1950). *Zur Entstehung und Geschichte von Aristoteles' Poetik*, Diss. (Zürich).

- Longo Auricchio, F. (1985). "Testimonianze dalla 'Retorica' di Filodemo sulla concezione dell'oratoria dei primi maestri epicurei," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 15: 31-61.
- Lundon, J. (1997). "Premessa alla traduzione di M. Pohlenz, Τὸ πρέπον, *Un contributo alla storia dello spirito greco* (Comunicazione presentata alla riunione del 10 febbraio 1933)," *Aevum Antiquum* 10: 5-11.
- Mangoni, C. (1993). Filodemo, *Il quinto libro della Poetica* (PHerc. 1425 e 1538), Edizione, Traduzione e Commento (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Marek, Chr. (1984). *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt: P. Lang).
- Martano, A. (2004). "Hieronymus ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου," in Fortenbaugh - White (2004): 457-74.
- Massimilla, G. (1996). Callimaco, *Aitia, libri primo e secondo*, introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento (Pisa: Giardini).
- Matelli, E. (1992). "Ἐνδιάθετος e προφορικὸς λόγος, note sull'origine della formula e della nozione," *Aevum* 66: 43-70.
- . (2004). "Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes," in Fortenbaugh - White (2004): 289-314.
- . (2006). "Peripato e Orfismo a Rodi," in A. Bernabé, F. Casadesús, M.A. Santamaría (eds.), *Orfeo y el orfismo; nuevas perspectivas* (Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes): 421-54 <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/orfeo-y-el-orfismo-nuevas-perspectivas--0/>, published also in *Aevum Antiquum* n.s. 6: 391-422.
- . (2009). "Questioni di epica arcaica comuni a Prassifane e ad Aristarco," *Aevum* 83: 31-60.
- . (2012). *Prassifane: testimonianze e frammenti. Filosofia e grammatica in età ellenistica* (Milano: Vita e Pensiero).
- Mirhady, D.C. (2001). *Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text, and Translation* in W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf, eds., *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion*. RUSCH 10 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- Montanari, F., Rengakos, A., Tsagalis, Chr., eds. (2009). *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, (Leiden - Boston: Brill).
- . (2000). "Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature," in W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf, eds., *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion*. RUSCH 9 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers): 391-411.

- . (2009). “Ancient Scholarship on Hesiod,” in Montanari - Rengakos - Tsagalis 2009: 314-42.
- Morau, P. (1951). *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d’Aristote* (Louvain: Éditions Universitaires).
- Mygind, B. (1999). “Intellectuals in Rhodes,” in Gabrielsen 1999: 247-93.
- Mützell, G.J. (1833). *De emendatione Theogoniae Hesiodeae libri tres* (Lipsiae: sumptibus C.H.F. Hartmanni).
- Nicolai, R. (1987). “Le biblioteche dei ginnasi,” *Nuovi Annali* 1: 17-48.
- Ophuijsen, J.M. van, Raalte, M. van, eds. (1998). *Theophrastus. Reappraising the Sources*. RUSCH 8 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publishers).
- Pfeiffer, R. ed. (1949). Callimachus, *Fragmenta*, vol. 1. (Oxonii: e Typographaeo Clarendoniano).
- Podlecki, A.J. (1969). “The Peripatetics as Literary Critics,” *Phoenix* 23: 114-137.
- Pohlenz, M. (1933). “Τὸ πρέπον. Un contributo alla storia dello spirito greco (Comunicazione presentata alla riunione del 10 febbraio 1933),” trad di J. Lundon, *Aevum Antiquum* 10 (1997): 11-57.
- Preller, L. (1842). *De Praxiphane peripatetico inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobili disputatio*, (Dorpati: ex Officina Academica J.C. Schünmanni Viduae) [= *Ausgewählte Aufsätze aus dem Gebiete der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, hrsg. von R. Kohler, Berlin 1864)].
- Ritschl, F. (1866). “Commentationis de Agathonis vita, arte et tragoe-diarum reliquiis particula,” in *Opuscula philologica*, vol. 1 (Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner).
- Rossetti, L., Furiani, P.L. (1993). “Rodi,” in *Lo spazio Letterario della Grecia antica*, direttori G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza, I, *La produzione e la circolazione del testo*, II, *L’Ellenismo*, (Roma: Salerno Editrice): II, 657-715
- Rostagni, A. (1926) “Il dialogo aristotelico ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΩΝ. I-II,” *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* N.S. 4: 433-70 [= *Scritti Minori*, I, Torino 1955, 255-293].
- . (1927). “Il dialogo aristotelico ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΩΝ. III,” *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* N.S. 5: 145-173 [= *Scritti Minori*, I, Torino 1955, 293-322].
- . (1930). *Arte poetica di Orazio* (Torino: Chiantore).

- Roussel, P., ed. (1914). *Inscriptiones Deli liberae. Decreta, Foedera, Catalogi dedicationes varia*, IG XI.4 (Berolini: apud Georgium Reimerum).
- Schenkeveld, D. (1993). "A Hellenistic *Ars Poetica*," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 97: 67-80.
- Schenkeveld, D. (1994). "Scholarship and Grammar," in *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, ed. F. Montanari, (Vandoeuvres - Genève: Fondation Hardt, Entretiens 40): 263-301, 302-06 (Discussion)
- . (1998). "Theophrastus' Rhetorical Works: One Rhetorical Fragment the Less, One Logical Fragment the More," in van Ophuijsen - van Raalte 1998: 67-80.
- Schorn, S. (2004). *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Schütrumpf, E., (2008). *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translations*. RUSCH 14 (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publisher).
- Segre, M. (1935). "Epigraphica. I. Catalogo di libri da Rodi," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica* N.S. 13: 214-222.
- Simon-Suisse, J. (1839). *Du commentaire de Proclus sur le Timée de Platon* (Paris: Imprimerie de Moquet et Comp.).
- Sitakou, E. (2009). "Callimachus Hesiodicus revisited," in Montanari-Rengakos-Tsagalis (2009): 219-52.
- SOD (2000). W.W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (eds.), *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion* by P. Stork, J.M. van Ophuijsen, T. Dorandi, RUSCH 9. (New Brunswick - London: Transaction Publisher)
- Suppl.Hell. Supplementum Hellenisticum*, ediderunt H. Lloyd-Jones, P. Parsons. (Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1983: De Gruyter).
- Susemihl, F. (1891). *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I, (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner) [= Hildesheim 1965].
- Tulli, M. (2007). "Filosofia e commedia nella biografia di Aspasia," in Erler - Schorn (2007): 303-17.
- Tuplin, C. (1993/94). "The Reputation of Thycydides: a note on fr. 18," *Archaiongnosia* 8: 181-97.
- Uhlig, G. (1883). *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*, in *Grammatici Graeci* 1.1, (Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner): 5-100.
- Wehrli, F. (Clearch.) *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Texte und Kommentar, *Klearchos*, 3. (Basel - Stuttgart 1969: Schwabe).

- . (Dem.Phil.) *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Texte und Kommentar, *Demetrios von Phaleron*, 4. (Basel - Stuttgart 1968²: Schwabe).
- . (Eud.) *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Eudemus von Rhodos. Texte und Kommentar* (Basel - Stuttgart 1969²: Schwabe).
- . (Phanias) *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Texte und Kommentar, *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes*, 9. (Basel - Stuttgart 1969^{2b}: Schwabe): 7-43.
- . (Prax.) *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Texte und Kommentar, *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes*, 9. (Basel - Stuttgart 1969^{2b}: Schwabe): 89-115.
- . (1968). "Eudemos von Rhodos," in *RE Suppl.* 11: coll. 652-658.
- . (1983a). "Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der Römischen Kaiserzeit," in Flashar (1983): 461-599.
- . (1983b). "Eudemos von Rhodos, Menon und weitere Aristoteles Schüler," in Flashar (1983): 530-33.
- Wehrli, F., Wöhrle, G., Zhmund, L. (2004). "Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der Römischen Kaiserzeit", in Flashar (2004): on Praxiphanes 602-03.
- White (Hier.) see Fortenbaugh - White (2004).
- Wilamowitz, U. von (1877). "Die Thykydideslegende," *Hermes* 12: 326-67. [= *Kleine Schriften* III, Berlin 1969: 1-40].
- . (1919). *Platon*, 2 voll. (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Wilamowitz, U. von (1924). *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 2 voll. (Berlin: Weidmann).

Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 3-11

[ACHILLES TATIUS] (3rd cent. AD)		ANDROTION (5th-4th cent. BC)	
<i>Vita Arati</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
9.5-9 Martin	479	<i>FGrHist</i> 324 F57	495-96
AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)		ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS (3rd cent. BC)	
<i>Varia Historia</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
2.37	383	2a Dorandi	418 n. 33
9.11	363	4a	418 n. 33
13.4	504 n. 19	34a	418 n. 33
		35a	418 n. 33
AESCHYLUS (5th cent. BC)		ANTIMACHUS COLOPHONIUS (5th-4th cent. BC)	
<i>Testimonia</i>		<i>Testimonia</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> T1.13 Radt	433 n. 87	2 Matthews	506
<i>TrGF</i> T1.14-5	432 n. 80		
<i>TrGF</i> T117a-g	390 n. 6, 429 n. 74		
<i>TrGF</i> T100-10	432 n. 80		
<i>Choephoroe</i>		ANTIPHANES (4th cent. BC)	
166	396 n. 15	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
1024-25	396	<i>PCG</i> F59	420 n. 41
AESOPUS (6th cent. BC)		APOLLODORUS (2nd cent. BC)	
<i>Fabulae</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
246 Chambry	425	<i>FGrHist</i> 244 F41	448 n. 20
		<i>FGrHist</i> 244 F213	417 n. 29
		<i>FGrHist</i> 244 F214	420 n. 39
AGATHON (5th cent. BC)		<i>FGrHist</i> 244 F214-8	417 n. 29
<i>Testimonia</i>		<i>FGrHist</i> 244 F216	420 n. 39
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T5 Snell	496	APOLLODORUS MYTHOGRAPHUS (1st-2nd cent. AD)	
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T6	510	<i>Bibliotheca</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T7b	501 and n. 12	3.6.1	405 n. 30
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T11	501	APOSTOLIUS, MICHAEL (15th cent. AD)	
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T22a	504 n. 19	<i>Collectio paroemiarum</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T22a-b	501	13.42	399 n. 19
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T22b	504 n. 19		
<i>TrGF</i> 39 T25	501		
<i>Fragmenta</i>		ARISTON CEUS (3rd cent. BC)	
<i>TrGF</i> 39 F2a Snell	505, 506	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
		4A SFOD	418
ANACREON (6th-5th cent. BC)			
<i>Fragmenta</i>			
27 [372] Page = 8 Gentili	428 n. 70		
43 [388] Page = 82 Gentili	428 n. 71		

580 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

ARISTOPHANES (5th cent. BC)		9 1451a36-b11	505
<i>Nubes</i>		9 1451a36-b32	504
1002-1008	482	9 1451a37-1452a11	351, 506 n.
<i>Pax</i>			21, 514, 516
607-9	437 n. 99	9 1451b2-3	503 n. 15
<i>Ranae</i>		9 1451b6-7	507 n. 23
868	365	9 1452b9	400 n. 20
1069-1072	482	9 1451b11	506
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i>		9 1451b11-29	505
164-167	388	9 1451b19-23	506
<i>Fragmenta</i>		9 1451b29-32	505, 506
<i>PCG F59b</i>	388	13 1453a17-21	398, 401
		13 1453a28-30	397
		14 1453b7-8	395
ARISTOTELES (4th cent. BC)			
<i>Ethica Eudemia</i>		14 1454a9-12	398
1.5 1216a16-19	369	14 1454a14	453
3.4 1232b4-9	510, 511 n. 32	17 1455b16-23	346
7 1234b18-1246a25	559	18 1456a25-27	397
<i>Ethica ad Nicomachum</i>		18 1456a25-30	403
1.5 1095b14-1096a4	366 n. 25	19 1456a34	453
1.5 1095b19-22	374 n. 50	19 1456b16-17	405
3.8 1128a22-5	508 n. 25	20 1456b20-1457a35	540
3.8 1128a23-25	396 n. 16	20-21 1456b20-1458a16	454, 458
8-9 1155a1-1172a14	559	21 1457b3-6	563
10.2 1172b26-36	371	21 1457b6-9	570 n. 226
10.3 1174a1-8	371	25 1460b6-1461b25	351
<i>Magna Moralia</i>		25 1460b34-35	390
2.15-17 1212b24-1213b30	559	26 1462a11-12	403
<i>Physica</i>		<i>Politica</i>	
5 226b14-16	538	5.10 1311b30-4	510 n. 30
<i>Poetica</i>		<i>Problemata</i>	
1 1447a-1447b	550 n. 135	30.1 954a34	380 n. 69
1 1447b9-13	552 n. 159	19.20 919a18-24	563 n. 202
1 1447b21-22	401 n. 22	<i>Rhetorica</i>	
3 1448a20-23	401	1-3 1354a-1420a	453
4 1448b25-6	396	1.4 1360a33-37	515
4 1448b35-6	401	2.2 1378a-1380a	406
4 1449a9-21	398, 402	2.2 1378a30-2	366 n. 26
4 1449a15-17	394	2.20 1393a26-1394a18	515
4 1449a20	396	2.20-21 1393a32-b4	515
5 1449a37ff.	393	2.20 1394a5-8	515
6 1449b27-28	398	3.1 1404a12-16	562 n. 203
6 1449b 31-1450a10	452 n. 33	3.1 1404a30-5	402 n. 25
6 1449b37-1450b20	403 n. 27	3.2 1405b23-28	437 n. 99
6 1450b17	395	3.9 1409b9	561

3.11 1413a7-10	507 n. 23	1.39 22a	380, 402
<i>Fragmenta</i>		1.39 21d - 1.40 22d	379
70-77	489	1.41 22d	379
99	372	1.41 22e-23a	379
100	372	3.3.36 89a	420 n. 39
101	372	3.27 84b	420
102	372	4.25 144e-f	362
103	372	5.4 177c	341
104	372 and n. 42	5.4 177e-f	341
105	372 n. 42	5.18 192a	375 n. 54
106	372	6.101-3 271b-272d	367
107	372	6.104-5 272d-273b	367
108	372	6.105 273b-c	361
109	372	6.105 273d	370
110	372	7.14 281e	420 n. 39
111	372	8.39 347e-f	361, 365
143	347	9.78 410a	420 n. 40
145	348	10.24 424e-f	373
175	348	10.29 427b	376
548a	383 n. 83	10.30 426c-427c	381 n. 74
646-7	382	10.30-34 427c-429f	381
14-22 Gigon	489, 550 n. 134	10.32 427e-428e	389
125	498, 500, 501 n. 11	10.33 428f	380 n. 72, 384 n. 89
366-404.3	550 n. 134	10.33 429a	381 n. 76, 383
368	347	10.33 429b	382, 383
398	348	10.35 429f	381
tit. 136, p. 548	550 n. 134	10.35 430c-d	381
		10.45 435a	363
ARISTOXENUS TARENTINUS (4th cent. BC)		10.48 436e-f	377
<i>Fragmenta</i>		10.77 452d	551 n. 152
11b Wehrli	418 n. 33	11.1 460a-b	374 n. 48
14	418 n. 33	11.3 460d	374 n. 48
25	418 n. 33	11.32 467d-11.110 504f	374 n. 48
47-50	550 and n. 137	11.34 468e-f	420 n. 39
113-16	550 and n. 137	11.85 493c-d	420 n. 39
114	423 n. 55	11.97 497e	375
117	416 n. 22, 439 n. 103	11.101 499f	378 n. 65
		12.3 511c-d	361, 365
ARRIANUS, FLAVIUS (1st-2nd cent. BC)		12.5 512a-d	371
<i>Alexandri Anabasis</i>		12.18 519f-520a	370, 380 n. 70
5.1	408	12.31 526b	369
		12.31 526d	361
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (2nd cent. AD)		12.57 540e-f	375 n. 51
<i>Deipnosophistae</i>		12.58 541b-c	369
1.27 15d	395	12.62 543e-f	363
1.39 21e-f	484	12.71 548d	551 n. 152

582 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

12.81 554e-f	371	13	373, 381-82
13.71 598d	438 n. 101	14	381 n. 75, 382-84
13.72 599c-d	502 n. 14	15	359, 404, 413, 436, 551 n. 143
13.80 603e	418 n. 33	16	363, 376 n. 29, 423
13.86 607e	418 n. 33	17	408, 436
14.7 617b	402	18	405, 407, 436
14.31 631c	395	19	405-6, 436
14.33 633a-b	551 n. 152	20	407-8, 436
15.33 686c	365 n. 22	21A-B	407, 436
		21B	436
AULUS GELLIUS (2nd cent. AD)		22A-B	407-8, 436
<i>Noctes Atticae</i>		23	405, 436
4.11.4	418 n. 33	24A-B	408, 436
		25	551 n. 143
CALLIMACHUS		26	429, 432
<i>Aetia</i>		27	421, 425, 427, 432
I, 1 Massimilla 57.1-20	532 n. 45	28	422-23 and n. 51, 427 and n. 67
<i>In Praxiphanem</i>		29	418
460 Pfeiffer	532	30	433
<i>Fragmenta</i>		31B	433 and n. 84
589 Pfeiffer	557 n. 178	32	432
		33	425
CALLISTHENES OLYNTHIUS (4th cent. BC)		34	429 n. 75, 434, 437
<i>Fragmenta</i>		35	421 and n. 45, 434-35
<i>FGrHist</i> 124 F46	429 n. 74	36	424, 425 and n. 62, 437
		37	426, 428, 431, 437
CALLISTRATUS ALEXANDRINUS (2nd cent. BC)		38	434
<i>Fragmenta</i>		39	414, 420-21, 423, 428, 429, 430
<i>FGrHist</i> 348 F3	424 n. 58	41	394, 395, 398-402, 413, 421, 432
		42	435 n. 93
CARNEISCUS (3rd-2nd cent. BC)		43A	383 n. 85, 384 n. 89, 389-90, 394, 425, 430, 439
<i>Fragmenta</i>		43B	380, 390
95 Capasso	503	43A-B	397, 428, 429, 430, 432
		44	396-97, 402, 413, 421 and n. 43, 423, 430, 439, 484
CHAMAELEON HERACLEOTES (4th-3th cent. BC)		45	395, 396 n. 16, 402 and n. 26, 423 and n. 52, 430, 433
<i>Fragmenta</i>		46	367 n. 28
2	398		
8	360, 361, 363 n. 18, 364-367, 376		
9	360, 361, 363 n. 18, 367-70, 373, 374 and. n 50, 376		
10	374-76, 384		
11	373, 374, 375, 376 n. 60, 377-79, 381, 384		
12	379-80, 384		
		CHOERILUS SAMIUS (5th cent. BC)	
		<i>Testimonia</i>	
		1 Bernabé	501 and n. 13
		5	496

Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 3-11 583

CHRYSIPPUS (3rd cent. BC)		118.8-10	551 and n. 138
SVF T13	552 n. 156	133	560 n. 197
		143	341
CICERO (1st cent. BC)		144	354
Brutus		145	341, 346
47	501	146	354
De finibus			
5.14	468	[DEMETRIUS] RHETOR (1st cent. BC - 1st cent. AD)	
Epistulae ad Atticum		De elocutione	
13.19.4	360 n. 7	55-58	479, 561
Orator			
12.39	515 n. 38		
CLEARCHUS SOLEUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)		DICAEARCHUS MESSANIUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
Fragmenta		Fragmenta	
17-18 Wehrli	559 n. 193	1.14 Mirhady	353 n. 17
44-9	375 n. 51	1.15	353 n. 17
		1.17	353 n. 17
CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (2nd-3rd cent. AD)		1.18	353 n. 17
Stromata		39	354 n. 21
1.14.62.2	418 n. 33	48	560 n. 196
1.16.79.3	446 n. 9	70	480 n. 12
		89-115	353 n. 17
		95	342-43
CLIDEMUS (4th cent. BC)		105	374 n. 49
Fragmenta		105-108	551 n. 141
FGrHist 323 F14	420 n. 40	112-115B	551 n. 140
CRITOLAUS PHASELINUS (2nd cent. BC)		DIDYMUS CHALCENTERUS (1st BC - 1st AD)	
Fragmenta		Fragmenta	
3 Wehrli	470	3, pp. 323-4 Schmidt	499
11	468	In Demosthenem Commenta	
15	464	1.14-5 Pearson-Stephens	420
		9.43-10.11	495 n. 1
DAMASTES SIGEUS (5th cent. BC)			
Fragmenta		DIODORUS SICULUS (1st cent. BC)	
1 Lanata	489, 558 n. 182	Bibliotheca	
		5.55	532 n. 44
DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)		8.19	368
Fragmenta			
1 SOD	366	DIOGENES LAERTIUS (3rd cent. AD)	
1.78	345 n. 11	Vitae Philosophorum	
80	543	1.118	418 n. 33
92	499 n. 9	3.5-6	480
106	510	3.7	556 n. 173
107	510	3.7-8	480, 556
108	510		

584 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

3.8	453 and n. 40, 478, 503 and n. 15, 556-559, 560	<i>FGrHist</i> 76 F 71 <i>FGrHist</i> 76 F 89	507 n. 23 514 n. 37
3.56	403		
3.57-8	360 n. 2	EPIPHANIUS (4th cent. AD)	
3.109	478 n. 4	<i>Anacephalaeosis</i>	
5	464	1.3.8	466 n. 6
5.2.5	527 n. 9	1.5.1-2	467
5.22	360, 372	<i>De fide</i>	
5.24	360	9.35-9	464, 537, 565
5.37	527 n. 8		
5.44	360 n. 6, 361	[EPIPHANIUS](4th cent. AD)	
5.46	361	<i>Panarion</i>	
5.47	362	<i>prooem.</i> 1.3.3	466 nn. 6-7
5.48	362 n. 12	<i>prooem.</i> 1.5.3	466-67 and n. 6
5.51-57	537 n. 76	<i>haer.</i> 7	466-67 and n. 6
5.58-60	353 n. 19		
5.59	364 n. 20	ERIPHUS (4th cent. BC)	
5.61-64	537 n. 77	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
5.78	345 n. 11	<i>PCG</i> F2	420 n. 41
5.82	366		
5.84	478 n. 4	EUDEMUS (4th cent. BC)	
5.88	370, 488	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
5.92	363	2 Wehrli	538 n. 79
7.200	552 n. 156	4	538 n. 80
9.62	418 n. 33	5	538 n. 79
10.13	448 n. 20	6	538 nn. 84-85
		9-24	539 n. 91
DIOGENIANUS (2nd cent. AD)		25-29	539 n. 93
<i>Paroemiae</i>		31-123	539 n. 92
7.18	399	59	534 n. 57
		98	540
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS (1st cent. BC)		124	538 n. 83
		127-32	539 n. 90
<i>De Thucidide</i>		151	538 n. 81
41	499 n. 9		
<i>De compositione verborum</i>		EUPOLIS (5th cent. BC)	
2-3	554	<i>Testimonia</i>	
		<i>PCG</i> T1	480 n. 11
DIONYSIUS THRAX (2nd cent. BC)		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Ars Grammatica</i>		<i>PCG</i> F35-47	482
§ 1, pp. 5.1-6.3 Uhlig	567 and n. 217	<i>PCG</i> F36	480, 557 n. 171
§ 12.21-22, p. 44.2-5 Uhlig	560	EURIPIDES (5th cent. BC)	
		<i>Supplices</i>	
DURIS SAMIUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)		158	405 n. 30
<i>Fragmenta</i>		<i>Testimonia</i>	
<i>FGrHist</i> 76 F 1	514 n. 37	<i>TrGF</i> T1 I A 2 Kannicht	432 n. 80

<i>TrGF</i> T1 I A 8	433 n. 87	HERMESIANAX (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
<i>TrGF</i> T106a	438 n. 101	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>TrGF</i> T135-41	432 n. 80	7.61-8 Powell	438 n. 101
<i>Fragmenta</i>			
<i>TrGF</i> F515 Kannicht Ma.	555, 561	HERMIPPUS (3rd-2nd cent. BC)	
EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS (3rd-4th cent. AD)		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Preparatio evangelica</i>		<i>FGrHistcont.</i> 1026 F75	
5.30	379 n. 67	Bollansée = 58 Wehrli	345 n. 11
10.11.13	359	<i>FGrHistcont.</i> 1026	
14.18.26	418 n. 33	F59 = 92	345 n. 11
		<i>FGrHistcont.</i> 1026	
		F55 = 93	551 n. 142
		<i>FGrHistcont.</i> 1026	
		F87a-b = 62	498, 499 n. 9
GLAUCUS RHEGINUS (5th-4th cent. BC)			
<i>Fragmenta</i>		HERODOTUS (5th cent. BC)	
1-6 Lanata	489, 558 n. 181	<i>Historiae</i>	
GORGAS (5th-4th cent. BC)		1.65	383 n. 81
<i>Fragmenta</i>		3.120-6	500 n. 10
82 F23 D.-K.	400 n. 20	6.75	377 n. 62
		6.84	377 n. 63
		6.127	367, 369
HECATAEUS ABDERITA (4th-3rd cent. BC)			
<i>Fragmenta</i>		HESYCHIUS ALEXANDRINUS (5th cent. AD)	
<i>FGrHist</i> 264 F21	420 n. 42	<i>Lexicon</i>	
HERACLIDES PONTICUS (4th cent. BC)		δ 1398 Latte	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		s.v. διατροχάδες	479, 507
1 Schütrumpf	363		
1.82	423 n. 55	HESYCHIUS MILESIUS (6th cent. AD)	
8	557 n. 178	<i>Vita Aristotelis</i>	
17.24c	511 n. 33	9	470, 536
17.28	551 n. 144		
17.29	551 n. 145	HIERONYMUS RHODIUS (3rd cent. BC)	
17.31	551 n. 146	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
17.34	551 n. 147	3A White	470
17.36	551 n. 148	10	542
17.38	544 n. 108, 558 n. 186	11-36	542
39	370 n. 38, 371	28	373, 489
40	370 n. 38, 371	29	373, 378 n. 65
42	370 n. 38	29	543
43	370 n. 38	30	542
45	428 n. 72	31	542
88	488	32	542
96-116	558 n. 186	33-34	489, 542
97-8	510	35	542
78-89 Wehrli	511 n. 33	36A-C	542
		37A-B	542

586 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

38A	542	1.332-35	342
38A-B	543	3.267-71	354
39	543	4	343
40	543	5.203-204	561
41	542, 551 n. 150	6.287-88	343
41-43	489, 558 n. 185	7	343
42	489	8	343
42A	542, 551 n. 150	8.153	405
42 A-C	543	9.346	375
43A-C	489.542	11.187ff.	554
44A-B	543	12.127-136	348
44-46	489	14.463-7	432 n. 81
45	543, 551 n. 151, 569 n. 223	16.220	555, 561
46 A-B	543	21.226	555, 561
47	542	21.295-304	401 n. 22
48	542	22.424	343
49	542	23.241	555
50	543	23.296	345 and n. 11, 346
50-52	489		
51	542	INSCRIPTIONES	
52	542	Agora Inventory R 257	536 n. 64
54	542	<i>Inscriptiones Atticae</i>	
55	542	IG I ³ 302, 28	496 n. 2
60A-B	542	<i>Inscriptiones Boeoticae</i>	
61	489	IG VII 1752.6-7	534
		<i>Inscriptiones Deliae</i>	
HOMERUS (9th cent. BC)		IG XI.2 225B5	533 and n. 52
<i>Ilias</i>		IG XI.2 287B85	533 n. 53
1.69	405	IG XI.4 613	446, 529 n. 13,
1.263-68	401 n. 22		533 and n. 54, 535
2.183	347	IG XI.4 614.2	446
2.319	348	296B18 Durrbach	533 n. 53
2.407ff.	341	298A121 Durrbach	533 n. 53
2.408	341	338Bc9 Durrbach	533 n. 53
2.409	341, 348	358.6 Durrbach	533 n. 53
2.763	554	<i>Inscriptiones Rhodiae</i>	
6.128-139	408	IG XII.1 1322	536 n. 64
7. 230	406 n. 31	IG XII.1 1409	536 n. 64
19.62	406	<i>ILind.</i> B 10.65-6	539 n. 94
10.415	407	<i>ILind.</i> C 4.32-33	539 n. 95
11.787	407	<i>ILind.</i> C 10.64-65	539 n. 95
13.460	406	<i>ILind.</i> C 32.67-8	539 n. 94
23.154	555, 561	<i>ILind.</i> C 32.68	539 n. 95
23.269	408	<i>ILind.</i> D 47-8	539 n. 94
<i>Odyssea</i>		<i>ILind.</i> D 87-8	539 n. 94
1.332	347	<i>ILind.</i> D 51-52	539 n. 95

Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 3-11 587

nr. 51 Blinkenberg (1941), pp. 242-64 Segre (1935), pp. 214-22 <i>Inscriptiones Lesbiae</i> IG XII Suppl. 127.13-17	539 n. 95 543 n. 107 527	LOBO ARGIVUS (3rd cent. BC ?) 1-8 Garulli = 8-14, 16 Crönert	490
ISOCRATES (5th-4th cent. BC) <i>In sophistas</i> 2 <i>Antidosis</i> 166 <i>Evagoras</i> 8-11 9-11 <i>Helенаe encomium</i> 65 <i>Panathenaicus</i> 16-34 18 18-19 19 33 34 263 <i>Panegyricus</i> 159 <i>Ad Nicoclem</i> 35 43-44 <i>Ad filios Jasonis</i> 2	 486 486 486 514 n. 37 486 486 486 486 557 486 486 514 n. 37 486 481 n. 13	LONGINUS, CASSIUS (1st cent. AD) <i>De Sublimitate</i> 36.3 39-41 LYCON (3rd cent. BC) <i>Fragmenta</i> 3B SFOD MARCELLINUS BIOGRAPHUS (4th cent. AD) <i>Vita Thucydidis</i> 22 25 28-30 29 MELANIPPIDES (5th cent. BC) <i>Fragmenta</i> 7 A 1 Del Grande = 18 T1 Sutton 7 A 2 Del Grande NICERATUS (5th cent. BC) <i>Fragmenta</i> SH 564 SH 565 OVIDIUS (1st cent BC - 1st cent. AD) <i>Metamorphoseon Libri</i> 12 PAPYRI <i>PBerol.</i> 9782 col. III 28-49 Bastianini-Sedley <i>PDuke</i> inv. G 178 col. 2.17-22 <i>PHamb.</i> 128 linn. 59-63b	 532 553 n. 164 470 498, 501 n. 11 499 n. 9 495 and n. 1 503 n. 15, 544, 545-49 501 and n. 13 496 401 n. 22 512 n. 33 471, 565 537 446, 454-58, 541, 563-64 and n. 207 570 n. 226

588 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

<i>PHerc.</i>		5.2 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1425 col.	
1005		12.23-33 Mangoni)	503
fr. 12, col. 7, lin. 16		5.2 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1425 col.	
Angeli-Colaizzo	546 n. 111	12.28-33 Mangoni)	479, 487, 488 n. 38
fr. 12, col. 7, linn. 15-16	552 n. 155	5.2 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1425	
fr. 12, col. 7, linn. 19-20	552 n. 155	col. 12.34-35 Mangoni)	551
1027	447-51	5.3 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1425 col.	
coll. 13-6, 18	503	14 Mangoni)	553 n. 163
<i>POxy.</i>		<i>De Signis</i>	549 n. 129
1176	416 and n. 24, 419	<i>Pragmateiai</i>	
1611		col. 19.1-5 Militello	447 n. 16
fr. 1 col. V 101-20	495 n. 1	<i>Rhetorica</i>	
1800	417	frs. 2-3 Longo Auricchio	552 and n. 154
<i>PSI</i>			
1219			
fr. 1.7-9	479	PHOTIUS (9th cent. AD)	
		<i>Lexicon</i>	
PAUSANIAS (2nd cent. AD)		s.v. οὐδέν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον	399 n. 19
<i>Graeciae descriptio</i>			
1.23.9	499 and n. 9		
		PINDARUS (6th-5th cent. BC)	
PAUSANIAS ATTICISTA (2nd cent. AD)		<i>Pythia</i>	
32.1-6	399 n. 19	4.205	407
		<i>Olympia</i>	
PHAENIAS ERESIUS (4th cent. BC)		13	421 n. 47
<i>Fragmenta</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
1-2 Wehrli	526	76 Snell-Mähler	486
4	527 n. 8	122	421 n. 48
22-33?	489, 558 n. 184		
32-33?	551 n. 139	PLATO (5th-4th cent. BC)	
		<i>Alcibiades II</i>	
PHILOCHORUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)		141d	547 n. 115
<i>Fragmenta</i>		<i>Apologia</i>	
<i>FGrHist</i> 328 F121	512	22b-c	391
<i>FGrHist</i> 328 F137	499 n. 9	<i>Gorgias</i>	
<i>FGrHist</i> 328 F159	420	470d-471d	500 n. 10
		471	547 n. 115
PHILODEMUS GADARENSIS (1st cent. BC)		525d	500 n. 10
<i>De musica</i>		<i>Ion</i>	
32.21 Kemke	354 n. 21	533e	391
<i>De poematibus</i>		<i>Leges</i>	
5 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1425, coll.		636e-650b	384 n. 88
1-12.9 Mangoni)	451-54	796c	395
5.2 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1425 col.		815b-d	395
12.10-33 Mangoni)	544, 549-56	<i>Menexenus</i>	
		235e-236a	501 n. 11

<i>Meno</i>		PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (1st-2nd cent. BC)	
99d	391	<i>Cato Minor</i>	
<i>Phaedrus</i>		65	551 n. 153
230b-c	499 n. 9	67ff.	551 n. 153
230b-e	483, 557	<i>Cimon</i>	
230c	482	4.2	498
243a-b	486	8.7-8	392
245a	391	13.7	482 n. 21
245a6-8	432 n. 81	<i>Lisander</i>	
246e	561	18.6	506
258e-59	483	<i>Theseus</i>	
259b-d	482	32.5	480
259b-e	483	<i>De exilio</i>	
269a	391	605c	499 n. 9
278b	483	<i>De Gloria Atheniesium</i>	
278e-279b	483	348d	400 n. 20
278e	481, 483, 557	<i>De Herodoti malignitate</i>	
279a-b	483	871a-b	431 n. 78
279b	483	<i>De proverbiiis Alexandrinum</i>	
<i>Philebus</i>		30	400
21a-d	371	<i>Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum</i>	
60b-e	371	1095d	501
67a	371	<i>Quaestiones Convivales</i>	
<i>Respublica</i>		615a	400
581e-583a	371 n. 41	<i>Regum et imperatorum apophtegmata</i>	
<i>Symposium</i>		177a	504 n. 19
223c-d	504 and n. 19		
<i>Theaetetus</i>			
142a-3b	511		
<i>Timaeus</i>		POLEMON (2nd cent. BC)	
17a	559-61	Fragmenta	
<i>Epistulae</i>		<i>FHG</i> 3.117 F4	499
XIII		<i>FHG</i> 3.117 F5	495
360c	481 n. 17		
		PORPHYRIUS (3rd cent. AD)	
[PLATO]		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Minos</i>		46F Smith	456 and n. 56
319c-320b	383 n. 80		
		POSIDIPPUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
PLATO COMICUS (5th-4th cent. BC)		<i>Testimonia</i>	
<i>Testimonia</i>		T*4 Austin-Bastianini	533 n. 52
<i>PCG</i> T4	496		
<i>PCG</i> T16	507	PRAXIPHANES (4th-3rd cent. BC)	
		8-23 Wehrli	477
		11-17 Wehrli	479

590 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

1A	526	20e	503 n. 15, 545, 559
1B	528	21	495, 497 n. 3, 514 n. 37, 544, 545, 557, 558
1C	526, 527	22	453 and n. 40, 478, 503 and n. 15, 545, 547, 556 and n. 170, 557 n. 174, 560, 567, 568
1D	527	23A-B	545, 557, 559, 567, 568
3A	445 n. 1, 471, 528	24	479, 540, 545, 556 and n. 170, 560, 561 and n. 201, 567, 568
3A-B	527 n. 9, 537	25	445 and n. 1, 545, 567, 568
3B	537	25	544, 545, 555, 566, 568
3C	470, 527 n. 9, 536	26	502 n. 14
3A-C	565	27	445, 446, 479, 487, 503, 544, 545, 549 and n. 131, 550 n. 132, 556 n. 170, 567, 568
4A-C	526	28A-B	502 n. 14, 534, 544, 545, 554, 555, 557, 561, 566, 568
6	448 n. 20, 535	29A	545
7	479, 526, 536, 537, 556 n. 170	29A-B	544
8	478 n.4	29A-C	554, 555, 568
9A	446 n. 9, 526, 527	30	568
9B	526, 527	30A-*B	545, 555, 568
9C	562, 563 and n. 205	31	479, 544, 545, 548, 553 n. 160, 555, 556 n. 170
9A-C	500 n. 10, 560, 561, 562, 566	*32	540, 541, 545, 556 and n. 170, 561 and n. 201, 563, 567, 568
10	445 and n. 1, 479, 526, 532, 533, 536, 537, 556 n. 170, 557, 564, 566	*33a-c	455, 540, 541, 545, 556, 560, 561 and n. 201, 563, 564 n. 207, 567, 568
11	479, 503 n. 15, 532 and n. 46, 536, 537, 556 n. 170, 557, 564, 566	*33b	570 and n. 226
13	528, 529, 570		
14	445, 446, 527, 529 n. 13, 533, 534 n. 54, 535, 569	PROCLUS (5th cent. AD)	
*15	445 n. 1, 527, 534, 569	<i>In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria</i>	
*16	445 n. 1, 527	21c, 90.20-26 Diehl	558 n. 178
*17	445 n. 1		
*17A-B	528, 533, 535, 569	PROLEGOMENA DE COMOEDIA	
*17B	533 n. 49	IV p. 12.16-7 Koster	507
18.1	544, 545	XIb p. 40.33-8	507
18.2	479, 487, 544, 549	XVIIIa pp. 71.37-72, 43	507
18.3	544		
18.4	545, 559	QUINTILIANUS (1st cent. AD)	
18.6	545	<i>Institutio Oratoria</i>	
18.*5	545	10.1.66	365
18.7	545		
18.8	545		
18.9	545		
18.10	545		
18.11	545		
19	464, 528, 545, 565		
20a-c	445		
20a-e	445, 447, 536, 559, 566		
20a, c-e	503		

<i>RHETORICA AD HERENNIUM</i> (1st cent. BC) 4.43-44 570 n. 226	SIMONIDES (6th-5th cent. BC) <i>Epigrammata</i> 88 Page = 25 West ² 424 n. 58 14 [732-735] Page 421 n. 46
[SAPPHO] (7th-6th cent. BC) <i>adesp.</i> 35 [953] Page 423	SIMPLICIUS (6th cent. AD) <i>In Aristotelis Categorias commentarium</i> p. 10.20-11.2 Kalbfleisch 456 and n. 56
SATYRUS (3rd-2nd cent. BC) <i>Vita Euripidis</i> T3a Schorn 416 n. 23 F 3 432 n. 80 F3-7 416 n. 23 F6 416 n. 24 F6 fr. 9 432 n. 81 F6 fr. 16 col. I 432 n. 81 F6 fr. 39 coll. V-VI 434 n. 88 F6 fr. 39 col. VII 1-27 434 n. 88 F6 fr. 39 col. VIII 434 n. 88 F6 fr. 39 col. IX 25-28 388 F6 fr. 39 col. XIX 2-11 509 F6 fr. 39 col. XIX 30-34 509 F6 fr. 39 col. XX 7-15 509 F6 fr. 39 col. XX 15-2 509 F*34 548 n. 124	SOPHOCLES (5th cent. BC) <i>Oedipus Rex</i> 1008 391 n. 7 <i>Oedipus Coloneus</i> 900 555 <i>Testimonia</i> <i>TrGF</i> T1.4, 6, 23 Radt 432 n. 80 <i>TrGF</i> T1.18 433 n. 87 <i>TrGF</i> T52 390 <i>TrGF</i> T95-9 432 n. 80
SCHOLIA <i>in Aristophanis Acharnenses</i> 10 365 <i>in Aristophanis Ranas</i> 85 501 n. 12 <i>in Aristophanis Vespas</i> 947b-c 495 n. 1 947c 512 <i>in Dionysium Thracem</i> pp. 19.23-20.6 Hilgard 507 <i>Londinensia in Dionysii Thracis</i> <i>Artem Grammaticam</i> 11, 515.19-25 Hilgard 563 and n. 205 <i>in Homeri Iliadem</i> 2.183 347 <i>in Homeri Odysseam</i> 1.332 342 1.332.87-88 344 n. 9 3.267 354 12.129 348 <i>in Pindari Olympia</i> 11.17 Drachmann 383 n. 83	SOSIBIUS (3rd-2nd cent. BC) <i>Testimonia</i> <i>FGrHist</i> 595 T1-4 362 n. 13 <i>Fragmenta</i> <i>FGrHist</i> F1-26 362 n. 13 <i>FGrHist</i> 595 F6 417 n. 29 <i>FGrHist</i> 595 F26 420 n. 39 SOSICRATES (2nd cent. BC) <i>Fragmenta</i> 10 Giannattasio Andria 433 n. 87 STESICHORUS (7th-6th cent. BC) <i>Fragmenta</i> 192 Davies 486 STOBAEUS (5th cent. AD) <i>Anthologium</i> 3.5.43 345 3.6.18 391 n. 7 STRABO (1st cent. BC - 1st cent. AD) <i>Geographica</i> 1.2.3 354 n. 21 13.2.3 526 n. 7 13.2.4 526 n. 6

592 Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaeleon of Heraclea

14.2.5	530-31 and n. 41	162	464
14.2.7	532 n. 44	196A	546 n. 110
14.2.8	542 n. 103	230	472
14.2.13	529	269	472
15.1.7-8	408	436.2-3	361 n. 10
		516	437 n. 99
STRATO LAMPSACENUS (3rd cent. BC)		532-46	559 n. 192
<i>Fragmenta</i>		551	361
5B Sharples	470	549	361
45-46	473 n. 22	550	361
47	464	551	366, 369 n. 35
62	473 n. 22	552A	363, 366
63A-B	473 n. 22	552B	363
82.8	364 n. 20	553	361
		556	361
SUDA LEXICON (10th cent. AD)		570	373
s.v. Choerilus, χ 595,		571	373
v.4 p. 834.24-33 Adler	393, 501	572	373
	and n. 13	573	373
s.v. Hellanicus, ε 739,		574	373
v. 2 p. 238.18-24	503 n. 15	575	373, 375
s.v. Eupolis, II ε 3657,		576	373
v. 2 p. 465.17-22	480 n. 11	577A-B	373
s.v. Melanippides, μ 454-55,		578	363
v. 3 p. 350.15-21	501 and n. 13	579A	383 n. 87
s.v. Phrynichus, φ 762,		579B	383 n. 86
v. 4 p. 766.17-24	393	579A-B	373 and n. 47
s.v. Pratinas, π 2230,		589.12	362
v. 4 p. 191.3-8	393	603	362
s.v. Thespis, θ 282,		652	407
v. 2 p. 711.5-13	393	666.19	550 n. 134
		666.20-21	550 n. 134
TATIANUS (2nd cent. AD)		666.22	550 n. 134
<i>Oratio ad Graecos</i>		666-709	353 n. 18
31	359, 438 n. 95	683	456 and n. 56
		697	515 n. 38
THEOPHRASTUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)		698-704	554 n. 165
<i>Historia plantarum</i>		727.6	362 n. 12
4.4	408	727.7-8	546 n. 110
<i>Fragmenta</i>		727.8	514 n. 37
1 FHS&G	527 n. 8	Appendix 9	564
1.42-4	373		
1-2	526	THEOPOMPUS (4th cent. BC)	
11.7	470	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
18.6	543 n. 106	<i>FGrHist</i> 115 F285b	431 n. 77
72A	540		

THESPIS (6th cent. BC)		VITA AESCHYLI	
Fragmenta		8-10	492
TrGF 1 F1 Snell-Kannicht	424	43	367
		68	365
THRASIMACHUS (5th cent. BC)		VITA ARISTOTELIS MENAGIANA	
Fragmenta		p. 402.20-23 Westermann	470
85 A5 D.-K.	507 n. 23		
THUCYDIDES (5th cent. BC)		VITA EURIPIDIS	
Historiae		II p. 3, 4-10 Schwartz	497 n. 4
1.21	497		
1.22	367 n. 30, 492 n. 8	VITA NICANDRI	
1.22.4	513, 547 n. 116	33 Crugnola = 61 Westermann	490
2.48	497	p. 3.3 Gow-Scholfield	558 n. 188
2.100.2	500		
4.104.4	497	XENOPHANES (6th-5th cent. BC)	
4.104-7	497	21 B21 D.-K.	437 n. 99
4.108	498		
5.26	498	ZENOBIUS (2nd cent. AD)	
8.68	500	Epitome collectionum	
Epigramma		Lucilli Tarrhaei et Didymi	
AP 7.45	497	5.40	399
TIMAEUS (4th-3rd cent. BC)		ZENO SIDONIUS (2nd-1st cent. BC)	
Fragmenta		De usu poematum vel De bonis	
FGrHist 566 F135	498	poematibus	
		fr. 12 (PHerc. 1005 col.	
		7.19-20) Angeli - Colaizzo	552 n.
			155
TIMON PHLIASius (4th-3rd cent. BC)		De Grammatica	
Fragmenta		fr. 12 (PHerc. 1005 col.	
786.372-73 Lloyd-Jones-		7.15-16)	552 n. 155
Parsons = 12 Di Marco	532 n. 46		
804 Lloyd-Jones-Parsons		De Historia	
= 30 Di Marco	480, 556 n. 172	fr. 12 (PHerc. 1005 col.	
		7.16)	548 n. 127, 552 n. 155
TIMOTHEUS (5th-4th cent. BC)			
Persae			
206-212 Hordern	437 n. 91		



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>